DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 099 SP 026 980

AUTHOR Tabachnick, B. Robert; Zeichner, Kenneth M.

TITLE The Development of Teacher Perspectives: Final Report.

INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 85
GRANT NIE-G-81-0009
NOTE 295p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Beliefs; Higher Education; *Perspective Taking; Policy Formation; *Socialization; *Student Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Teaching Perspectives

ABSTRACT

This longitudinal study of the development of perspectives toward teaching consists of three major phases: (1) an examination of the impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives; (2) an examination of the continuing development of teacher perspectives during the first year of teaching; and (3) further exploration of several theoretical and methodological issues related to the study of teacher socialization which emerged during the first two phases of the study. In phase one of the study, the perspectives of 13 student teachers were examined and documented during their 15-week student teaching experience. During the second phase of the study, four of the original group were followed into their first year of teaching. Phase three explored several theoretical, methodological, and policy related issues that arose during the course of the study. The final report is organized to correspond to the three major phases of the study and their implications for policy, research, and practice. Four papers which address methodological and theoretical issues in studying the development of teacher perspectives are included. The final section contains an analysis of the implications of the entire project for policy, practice, and research in teacher education and schools. The appendices include the Teacher Belief Inventory used in the study, case studies of the four beginning teachers, and statements on the dilemmas of teaching. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES:

FINAL REPORT

B. Robert Tabachnick and Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin-Madison

September, 1985

The research reported herein was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The successful completion of this project owes thanks to many persons. At the top of the list are the student teachers, teachers, university supervisors, principals, and pupils who agreed to be observed and interviewed during the study. Particular thanks go to Sarah, Beth, Hannah, and Rachel who unselfishly gave us so much of their time and allowed us to share a significant stage in their professional lives. We would also like to thank the project assistants who contributed much to the study during its various stages. Without Kathleen Densmore's colleagueship throughout the entire study and the contributions of Susan Adler, Kathleen Egan, and Glenn Hudak at various stages, this study would not have been possible. Finally we would like to express our deep appreciation to Elvira Benter, the project secretary, whose high standards and highly skilled and professional work in the preparation of reports and papers and in the overall management of our office has been invaluable to the completion of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I

Executive Summary

Section II

Phase I: The Study of Student Teaching

. The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives

Section III

Phase II: The Study of the First Year of Teaching

. Social Strategies and Institutional Control in the Socialization of Beginning Teachers

Section IV

Phase III: Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Studying the Development of Teacher Perspectives

. Individual and Institutional Influences on the Development of Teacher Perspectives

. Content and Contexts: Neglected Elements in Studies of Student Teaching as an Occasion for Learning to Teach

. Individual and Contextual Influences on the Relationships Between Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Behaviors

Section V

Implications for Policy, Practice and Research

. The Wisconsin Study of Teacher Socialization: Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

Section VI

Appendices

A. The Teacher Belief Inventory

B. Case Studies of Rachel, Hannah, Beth, and Sarah

C. Dilemmas of Teaching

D. Presentations and Publications

E. Project Staff

SECTION I

Executive Summary

The Teacher Perspectives Project: Executive Summary

This longitudinal study of the development of perspectives toward teaching consists of three major phases: (1) an examination of the impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives; (2) an examination of the continuing development of teacher perspectives during the first year of teaching; and (3) further exploration of several theoretical and methodological issues related to the study of teacher socialization which emerged during the first two phases of the study. The implications of our findings for practice, research, and policy in teacher education and schooling were considered during each major phase of the project.

Throughout this project we have employed the interactionist construct of perspectives to understand the process of learning to teach. This construct, which has its theoretical roots in G. H. Mead's construct of "the act" (Mead, 1938), refers to:

> A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation; a person's ordinary way of thinking or feeling about and acting in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective . . . and are seen by the actor as providing justification for acting as he does. (Becker et al., 1961, p. 34)

According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes, since they involve actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, perspectives are defined in relation to specific problematic situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies. Finally, the construct of perspectives focuses attention on the interrelationships between social context and individual abilities and

dispositions in the process of learning to teach. Unlike many functionalist approaches to the study of teacher socialization which focus exclusively on the influence the social context, or many psychological approaches which focus exclusively on individuals' beliefs, knowledge, and dispositions, our essentially social-psychological approach to the problem enabled us to assess the influence of both individual and contextual factors on the development of teachers.

The longitudinal aspect of the project enabled us to more adequately address the issue of causality in the development of perspectives than if we had followed the more common practice of employing a cross-sectional design. Each of the four teachers who were studied in Phases I and II of the project were observed and interviewed over a one and on-half year period in two different school settings. This longitudinal study of teacher socialization comes at a time when major reviews of the literature have called for such longitudinal analyses of teacher development (e.g., Lanier, 1985).

This examination of the socializing conditions of schools and universities and of the process of learning to teach, illuminates important aspects of the nature of schooling itself. The substance and forms of socialization reveal the underlying structures of attitude and belief that are the institution's base of support. At the same time, the strength and skill with which both individual teachers and institutions welcome or resist change becomes, ultimately, a key to understanding the most likely roads to strengthening and improving school programs. Teacher education and the process of learning to teach have recently been singled out in national debates over the quality of schooling as key factors in determining school effectiveness. This

project contributes evidence related to the quality and impact of teacher education which can inform these current deliberations on school effectiveness and has implications for both the conduct of teacher education programs and the organization of schools as environments for learning to teach.

Phase I

During the first phase of our work, we examined the teaching perspectives of 13 student teachers enrolled in an elementary teacher education program at a large midwestern university and documented the development of teaching perspectives by these students during their 15-week student teaching experience. We sought to identify through survey, interviews, and observations the perspectives of the 13 student teachers in relation to four specific domains: knowledge and curriculum, the teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships, and student diversity, and to identify: (1) changes that took place in these perspectives during the semester, and (2) the individual and social influence on student teacher development.

We concluded on the basis of this first phase of our study that student teaching did not generally result in substantial changes in teaching perspectives. With the exception of three of the 13 student teachers who chose to comply strategically with the demands of their work settings, teaching perspectives solidified but did not change direction over the course of the semester. For the most part, students become more articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the perspectives that they had possessed in less developed forms at the beginning of the semester.

These findings from the first phase of the project suggest several directions for research on student teacher socialization and for the conduct of student teaching programs. For example, our finding that student teachers for the most part are able to control the direction of their socialization to teaching and to develop more elaborate versions of the perspectives evident at the beginning of the semester is contrary to the conventional wisdom in the field and to the results of numerous studies (including some of our own earlier work) which have indicated that student teachers' perspectives are significantly altered during student teaching. Our work suggests, that under certain conditions, it may be possible to help student teachers to exert some control over their situations rather than being passively controlled by them. Our work also underlines the inappropriateness of viewing the student teaching experience as a unitary entity unrelated to specific program content and contexts. The report of Phase I of our study, "The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives" (see Section II of this report), discusses several aspects of program content and contexts which are likely to influence the course of teacher socialization. Another paper centered in this report, "Content and Contexts: Neglected Elements in Studies of Student Teaching as an Occasion for Learning to Teach" (see Section IV of this report), discusses the implications for research on student teacher socialization which are suggested by the findings of this phase of our study.

Finally, one significant element of this first phase of our study was the development of the Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI) as a vehicle for selecting our sample of 13 students. This instrument is contained

in Appendix A of this report. Its use in the study is discussed in the report of Phase I (see Section III of this report).

Phase II

During the second phase of the study, we followed four of the original group of 13 students into their first year of teaching and asked two broad questions related to the theme of teacher development: (1) How are teaching perspectives evident at the end of student teaching strengthened or modified during the first year of teaching? (2) What individual and social factors influence the continuing development of teaching perspectives?

We continued to use the four orienting categories of perspectives during this phase to describe teachers' actions and ideas. Each of the four categories was further defined in terms of several specific dilemmas of teaching which had emerged in the analysis of data from phase one of the study (see Appendix C). During this phase we spent three one-week periods with each of the four teachers. Using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods, we observed the classrooms of the four teachers and interviewed the teachers, their principals, and selected pupils and colleagues, in addition to analyzing a variety of documents such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks.

For the most part, the literature on beginning teacher socialization has emphasized central tendencies of development in groups of beginning teachers while assuming school contexts to be relatively homogeneous and free of contradictory socializing patterns. This strategy tends to obscure important differences among teachers and among and within schools and is problematic given the findings of the second

phase of our study. These findings suggest that the continuing development of teacher perspectives during the formal transition from student teacher to teacher is much more varied and context-specific than is typically portrayed in the teacher socialization literature. No one explanation offered currently in the literature can account for the induction experiences of these four teachers, including: (1) explanations of the degree of continuity or discontinuity in teacher development; (2) explanations of the key influences on beginning teacher development; (3) explanations of the balance between individual intent and institutional constraint in the socialization of beginning teachers. The journeys of these four teachers from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching must necessarily be viewed in a manner that accounts for both the uniqueness and the commonality of their experiences.

Although these four teachers began their first year of teaching with fairly similar teaching perspectives, there were significant differences in the teachers' abilities and inclinations to implement their performed perspectives and in the nature of the constraints and opportunities presented to teachers in each school. Despite the fact that three of the four teachers worked in very different situations as first-year teachers than as student teachers (different in the kinds of constraints, possibilities, school traditions, and cultures), only one of the four teachers conformed to the commonly accepted scenario and significantly changed her perspectives in a more bureaucratic direction in response to the pressures of organizational demands. Two of the teachers maintained, with varying degrees of success, significant elements of their perspectives that were in conflict with the

institutional biases in their schools. With the support and encouragement of a few teachers in her school, the fourth teacher continued on a course of development that was already evident at the end of student teaching.

We used an elaborated version of Lacey's (1977) conceptual framework of social strategies and a modified version of Edwards' (1979) framework of organizational control mechanisms to analyze the interactions between the initial perspectives of the four teachers and the institutional constraints and encouragement in their schools. This analysis indicated that different combinations of individual and institutional factors (both formal and informal) were most salient in individual cases for describing the development of teacher perspectives. Case studies of the development of each of the four teachers from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching (see Appendix B) describe the particular constellation of factors which was most explanatory in each instance. The report of the second phase of the study, "Social Strategies and Institutional Control in the Socialization of Beginning Teachers" (see Section III of this report), discusses the development of teacher perspectives utilizing the constructs of social strategy and institutional control mechanisms.

Several theoretical, methodological, and policy related issues arose during the course of our study and were further explored during the third and final phase of the project in a series of individual papers. The implications of our findings for policy, practice, and research are discussed in "The Wisconsin Study of Teacher Socialization: Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research" (see Section V of this report). A second paper, "Individual and Institutional Influences on

the Development of Teacher Perspectives," reexamines the literature on teacher socialization in light of the findings from this project and focuses on four major issues: (1) the nature of teacher perspectives; (2) the influence of specific socialization agents and mechanisms on the development of teacher perspectives; (3) the relative contribution of individual intent and institutional constraint to the development of teacher perspectives; and (4) the degree of stability in individual teachers' perspectives from the advent of formal training through the early years of a teacher's career (see Section IV of this report).

As mentioned above, a third paper, "Content and Contexts: Neglected Elements in Studies of Student Teaching as an Occasion for Learning to Teach" (see Section IV of this report), explores content and context related features which need to be taken into account in studies of teacher socialization. Finally, a fourth paper, "Individual and Contextual Influences on the Relationships Between Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Behaviors: Case Studies of Two Beginning Teachers in the United States" (see Section IV of this report), examines different strategies employed by beginning teachers to reduce discrepancies between beliefs and actions.

This final report has been organized to correspond to the three major phases of the study and their implications for policy, research, and practice. The second section of the report contains a report of the study of student teaching. The third section contains a report of the study of the first year of teaching. The fourth section contains the four papers mentioned above which address methodological and theoretical issues in studying the development of teacher perspectives. The final section contains an analysis of the implications of the entire project

for policy, practice, and research in teacher education and schooling. All of the papers which have been selected for inclusion in this Final Report represent the most concise descriptions of the various aspects of our project which were available from the project papers. A complete list of project papers and publications is located in Appendix D, together with the complete case studies which were the basis for much of the work reported (Appendix B).

References

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1964). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, R. (1979). Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books.

Hoy, W., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 23-26.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lanier, J. (1985). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Third handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, G. H. (1938). The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SECTION II

Phase I: The Study of Student Teaching

THE IMPACT OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES*

B. Robert Tabachnick
and
Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin-Madison

June, 1984

*The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

THE IMPACT OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

This paper reports selected findings from a study which examines the role of student teaching in the development of perspectives toward teaching. The study on which this paper is based explored three general questions related to the socializing role of student teaching: (1) What were the teaching perspectives of a group of student teachers at the beginning of their final student teaching semester? (2) What changes in teaching perspectives occurred during the 15-week student teaching experience? (3) What was the relative contribution of personal context (e.g., teachers' implicit theories, intentions, and personal biographies) and institutional context (e.g., external resources and institutional constraints) to the development of teacher perspectives? The present paper focuses on the findings related to the issue of continuity or discontinuity in perspectives during student teaching (Questions 2 and 3). A more detailed description of the substance of the perspectives of the student teachers and of the particular individual and institutional influences on their development is presented in the complete report of the study (Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982).

In their research on medical students, Becker et al. (1961, p. 34) defined perspectives as, "a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation." According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes since they include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, unlike values,

perspectives are specific to situations and do not represent generalized beliefs. In an earlier paper (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80), we applied the concept of perspectives in a study of student teachers and defined teacher perspectives as the ways in which teachers thought about their work (e.g., purposes, goals, conceptions of children, curriculum) and the ways in which they gave meaning to these beliefs by their behavior in classrooms. Our use of teacher perspectives was similar to that employed by several other researchers (e.g., Janesick, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975). In the present study we again utilize the construct of teacher perspectives to examine student teacher behavior and ideas in relation to the following areas: (1) knowledge and curriculum; (2) the teacher role; (3) teacher-pupil relationships; and (4) student diversity.

The Student Teaching Experience

Currently there is a great deal of debate in the literature over the role that the student teaching experience plays in the development of teachers and over the relative contribution of various individual and institutional factors to the socialization process (Zeichner, 1980). On the one hand, some have argued that biography as opposed to formal training or teaching experience is the key element in teacher socialization and that student teaching plays little part in altering the perspectives that students bring to the experience.

For example, Lortie (1975) argues that the socialization of teachers occurs largely through the internalization of teaching models during the thousands of hours spent as pupils in close contact with

teachers. In Lortie's view, it is the activation of this "latent culture" with the onset of school experience that is the major influence in shaping students' conceptions of the teaching role and role performance. Formal training in pedagogy at the university, including student teaching, is seen as having little effect in comparison with the influence of pretraining experiences.

This view which emphasizes the primacy of biography in teacher development has received empirical support in two recent United States studies (Silvernail & Costello, 1983; Zeichner & Grant, 1981); in an Australian study conducted by Petty and Hogben (1980); and in two British studies (Maddox, 1968; Mardle & Walker, 1980). It is also consistent with several other views of teacher development that locate the major socializing influences at a point prior to the advent of formal training (e.g., Stephens, 1968; Wright & Tuska, 1967).

On the other hand, some have argued that student teaching does have a significant impact on the development of teachers, an effect which is then strengthened during the early years of a teacher's career. However, while there is agreement among the advocates of this position about the potency of impact, there is also much disagreement about the specific nature of the impact and about the individual and institutional factors that are related to student teacher development.

First, there are those who argue that student teaching represents the beginning of a process where the alleged "liberalizing" impact of campus-based preparation is reversed and who see the universities in conflict with the schools over the allegiance of student teachers. Several British and North American studies provide some evidence that the impact of campus-based preparation is "washed out" beginning during

student teaching and continuing on into later teaching experience (see Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, for a discussion of these studies).

The major debate among those who hold this view is over which particular socializing agents or mechanisms play the most influential role in reversing the impact of the college. Cooperating teachers (Yee, 1969), the ecological characteristics of classrooms (Copeland, 1980), and the bureaucratic characteristics of schools (Hoy & Rees, 1977) are examples of some of the factors that have been identified as culprits.

Second, there are those who argue that student teaching plays a significant role in teacher development, but who emphasize the continuity between campus-based preparation, student teaching, and later teaching experience. According to this view, the effects of campus-based preparation are not "washed out" by student teaching and later school experience but are in fact strengthened by these experiences; the colleges and schools are seen to have complimentary effects upon teacher development.

Those who hold this view typically examine the impact of formal preparation, including student teaching, within a larger sociopolitical context. Campus-based training, student teaching, and later school experience are all seen as furthering the development of teachers who subscribe to educational commitments which do not challenge existing occupational, institutional, and cultural patterns. Dale's (1977) arguments regarding the development of a cognitive style of individualism and Bartholomew's (1976) analysis of the development of an objectivist conception of knowledge are illustrative of this position. While student teaching is not singled out by the advocates of this position as

uniquely influential, it is viewed as having an effect which solidifies and confirms perspectives that are brought to the experience.

Despite the existence of these conflicting views of the role of student teaching in the development of teachers and of studies which lend support to each of the three positions, we generally know very little about the impact of student teaching on the professional perspectives of student teachers. There are several reasons for our current lack of knowledge in this area and which point to the need for further studies of the impact of the student teaching experience.

First, despite the literally hundreds of studies that have been conducted on the impact of student teaching, relatively few researchers have actually examined what takes place during the experience itself; how professional life is interpreted and acted upon as students participate in its ongoing affairs. Most studies, by relying exclusively upon the pre- and post-administration of questionnaires and surveys for their data and not upon observing and talking with students as the experience evolves, have failed to address many important questions related to this experience (see Zeichner, 1984). Because the impact of student teaching (i.e., if any) occurs during student teachers' daily interactions with children and with school and university personnel (Tabachnick, 1976) and because much of what students actually learn during this experience may be unanticipated by program designers (Romberg & Fox, 1976), most of the extant research on student teaching has failed to illuminate the nature of operative socializing mechanisms during this experience. The actions and interactions of student teachers <u>during</u> the experience must be treated as problematic if we are to understand the impact of student teaching upon prospective teachers.

Second, most studies of student teaching have been limited to investigations of student teacher ideologies. Sharp & Green (1975, pp. 68-69) define a teaching ideology as "a connected set of systematically related beliefs and ideas about what are felt to be the essential features of teaching . . . a broad definition of the task and a set of prescriptions for performing it, all held at a relatively high level of abstraction." Sharp & Green (1975) distinguish a teaching ideology from the more situationally specific and action-oriented construct of teacher perspective.

By focusing almost exclusively upon student teacher ideologies and expressed attitudes (independent of any particular context), the existing research on student teaching has given us a very limited view of the impact of this experience on the professional development of student teachers. As Keddie (1971) among others has shown, we cannot assume a direct correspondence between teacher ideologies, which exist at a fairly high level of abstraction, and the perspectives which guide daily classroom practice. Given the inevitable contradictions which exist between these two levels of analysis, it becomes important for researchers to go beyond the level of ideology to understand adequately the role of student teaching in the development of teachers.

However, despite the general lack of attention to the analysis of perspectives, some studies do exist which have sought to examine the impact of student teaching on the development of teacher perspectives. These studies (e.g., Gibson, 1976; Haslam, 1971; Iannaccone, 1963; Popkewitz, 1979; and Tabachnick et al., 1979-80) have provided fairly consistent data about the impact of student teaching on the teaching perspectives of student teachers. Generally, these studies indicate

that student teaching contributes to the development of instrumental perspectives, where what works in the short run to get the class through the required lesson in a quiet and orderly manner becomes the major criterion for evaluating a teaching activity. Within this perspective, technique of teaching becomes an end in itself rather than a means toward some specified educational purpose.

Although these studies have provided important information about the ways in which the student teaching experience affects the teaching perspectives of student teachers, they all have at least one major weakness which severely limits their usefulness. Specifically, while in each of these studies there were students who did not fit the dominant pattern of development, the reports of the studies focus largely on illuminating the characteristics of the one dominant perspective within some group. Thus, despite evidence in each of these studies that student teaching to some degree has a differential impact on students, our knowledge about the teaching perspectives of student teachers is largely limited to the gross indicators of central tendencies. In short, these studies imply an overly deterministic view of the socialization process which is inconsistent with some of their own data, with recent literature on occupational socialization (e.g., Bucher & Stelling, 1977), and with recent literature on the socialization of teachers (e.g., Lacey, 1977). The heterogeneous nature of student teacher perspectives which corresponds to the variety of perspectives existent in the occupation as a whole (see Feiman-Nemser & Floden, in press), has not been adequately addressed by these studies. In the present study, we were interested in expanding upon this previous work on student teacher perspectives by documenting the range and diversity

of perspectives that existed among a group of students within a given program and by determining the degree to which both individual and institutional factors contribute to the development of perspectives during student teaching.

Methodology

The subjects for this study were 13 student teachers (all women) who were enrolled in an elementary student teaching program at a large midwestern university during the spring semester of 1981. Student teaching and a weekly campus seminar preempt a full university semester (15 weeks), which is the final semester in a four-semester professional sequence leading to certification in grades kindergarten through eight.

During December, 1980, a 47-item Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI) was developed by the staff of the research project on the basis of our own previous work on teacher perspectives (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80) and on the basis of the literature on teachers (Bussis et al., 1976). This instrument attempts to assess student teacher beliefs related to six specific categories: (1) the teacher's role; (2) teacher-pupil relationships; (3) knowledge and curriculum; (4) student diversity; (5) the role of the community in school affairs; and (6) the role of the school in society.[1]

In January, 1981, the TBI was administered to all 40 student teachers who were enrolled in the elementary student teaching program. Following this administration, 13 students (a 28 percent sample) were selected for more intensive study. These students were chosen to give us a group of student teachers who appeared to have markedly different

beliefs within each category measured by the TBI and whose overall profiles differed markedly from one another. We also sought a representative sample in terms of: (1) the characteristics of the settings in which the student teachers worked (urban, suburban), and (2) the grade levels at which the student teachers taught (primary, intermediate). Finally, we attempted to include a variety of school organizational patterns in our sample (e.g., teaching teams or units, self-contained classrooms) and to select a group of schools which offered the maximum possible diversity in community and pupil characteristics.

Between January and May, 1981, each of the 13 student teachers was interviewed at least five times and observed while teaching at least three times. The student teachers were provided with transcriptions of all of their own interviews and were invited to clarify, elaborate, or suggest changes to their original responses. In the first interview we attempted to confirm our initial interpretation of the student teacher profiles that were constructed on the basis of the TBI; to construct a brief biographical history of each student (e.g., to identify unique factors in their upbringing and school experience); and to identify the students' expectations and goals for the semester. In subsequent interviews we sought to explore student teacher beliefs related to each of the six orienting categories and to discover any new significant and empirically grounded dimensions of perspectives that we had not anticipated. Three of the five interviews also included a line of questioning based on the specific lessons observed, which sought to clarify the observers' perceptions of the lessons, the student teachers' intentions for the lessons, and how student teachers gave meaning to their actions

after they occurred. The classroom observations lasted for a minimum of one-half day. Each observer constructed narrative descriptions of events in a student's classroom with a particular focus on one or more of the six orienting categories during each observation.

In addition to identifying the substance and dimensions of the perspectives of the 13 student teachers, we sought to examine through interviews with student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors the sources of influence related to the development of perspectives and how (if at all) perspectives changed during the course of the semester. The cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor for each student were interviewed once at the end of the semester regarding their views about the teaching perspectives of their student teachers; their perceptions of changes that occurred in these perspectives over the course of the semester; and about how they attempted to influence, and felt they did in fact influence, their students.

Each triad member was also asked about the nature of the constraints they saw being placed upon what and how the student teacher taught, either by the student him/herself, the cooperating teacher, the school or the university, and about their perceptions of how the other triad member(s) had influenced the student teacher over the course of the semester.

Nearly 1,500 typed pages of protocol materials were generated from the taped interviews and from the records of classroom observations. The first step in the data analysis was the development of 13 individual profiles that attempted to describe the most salient aspects of each student's perspective toward teaching. While the original six orienting categories provided the basis for this analysis, the dimensions within

each category were recast to reflect the data that were collected about each student.

Perspectives Toward Teaching

Students readily expressed their ideas and were observed in teaching behaviors related to those components of teacher perspective which we had labeled teacher role, teacher-pupil relations, knowledge and curriculum, and pupil diversity. Students had obviously thought much less about, had less to say about, and were observed rarely in situations in which they acted on those components of teacher perspectives which dealt with community-school relations and school-in-society.[2]

Our initial analysis led to the grouping of students into three sets of perspectives that might roughly be characterized as conservatively traditional, progressive, and a group whose members had a mixture of some of the characteristics of conservatively traditional and progressive perspectives. The most disturbing consequence of forming groups in this way was that differences within each group that might be important, or at least intriguing, were obscured. In order to enable us to recognize and identify important differences within each perspective and important similarities between students in different groups, we made two decisions. First, we decided to examine each individual student's perspective separately and not to group students into the three categories. Second, we turned to the concept of <u>dilemma</u> as developed by Berlak and Berlak (1981) as a way of describing student perspectives toward teaching. We identified 18 dilemmas related to the four remaining orienting categories of perspectives which all 13 student

teachers recognized, discussed, and acted upon in their classrooms. These appeared to be genuine dilemmas for most students who were pulled in contradictory directions by conflicting appeals within each dilemma.

These 18 dilemmas were used to construct a set of profiles, each of which described the teaching perspectives of a student teacher. Each student's characteristic way of resolving each of the 18 dilemmas was ascertained through analysis of the interview and observational data, and teaching perspectives were defined according to students' dominant modes of resolving the 18 dilemmas of teaching. While space does not permit the presentation of all of the individual profiles together with the documentation supporting them, Table 1 illustrates the nature of these profiles by presenting the profiles of four student teachers.

/ Insert Table 1 about here /

The four students in Table 1 demonstrate the extent to which interesting similarities and differences are suppressed when students are grouped. Emily and Marilyn would be grouped together as "conservatively traditional," while Donna and Constance would be grouped together as having "progressive" perspectives toward teaching.

Emily and Marilyn are alike in their resolutions of dilemmas related to knowledge and curriculum. They act toward knowledge as though it can exist independently of the people who have it. Their curriculum was designed to get correct pupil responses that confirmed whether pupils had learned what their teachers wanted them to know. Currriculum was arranged into teachable bits, where possible, for efficiency of transmission. In other ways they differ. Emily's

relations with pupils are coolly correct, detached, controlling while Marilyn's relations with pupils are more personal, warmer. Marilyn is somewhat less bureaucratic than Emily, acting to interpret rules rather than simply obeying them as best she can.

Donna and Constance are also much alike in their ways of acting on knowledge and curriculum. They view knowledge as more problematic, strongly influenced by the personal meanings of learners. They aim to help pupils capture whole configurations of knowledge and encourage individual and inventive pupil responses emphasizing processes of learning and discovery as well as learning products. Their relations with pupils are close and their control of pupils is firm but unobtrusive. Both see teachers as making important contributions to how and what to teach and both expect to interpret organizational rules in light of the needs of their pupils. Each of the four student teachers has a reaction to student diversity different from the others, picking and choosing to act in accordance with personal interests and specific situations.

The Role of Student Teaching in Teacher Development

This section examines the findings related to the issue of continuity or discontinuity in teaching perspectives during student teaching and the potency of student teaching as a socializing force. To what degree did the teaching perspectives of student teachers change during the course of the 15-week semester? To what degree did any initial differences in student teachers' perspectives disappear by the end of the semester? What was the relative influence of individual

intent and institutional constraint in the development of teacher perspectives during student teaching?

First, our data clearly indicate that student teaching did not result in a homogenization of teacher perspectives. Students came into the experience with different teaching perspectives, and significant differences among students remained at the end of the semester. The existence of diverse perspectives at the end of the experience, however, does not by itself address the question of potency of impact. Conceivably, students could have entered the experience with diverse perspectives and then shifted in response to the diverse perspectives of their supervisors and the norms existent in their school placements. The diversity which existed at the end of the experience could in fact reflect a powerful shaping influence of institutional imperatives on relatively malleable student teachers. The issues of the homogenization of perspectives and potency of impact need to be examined separately.

With regard to the question of the strength of the impact of student teaching, our analyses of interviews and observations with students, and interviews with cooperating teachers and university supervisors overwhelmingly indicate that student teaching did not significantly alter the substance of the teaching perspectives that the 13 students brought to the experience. On the contrary, with the exception of three students, teaching perspectives <u>solidified</u> but did not <u>change</u> fundamentally over the course of the 15-week semester. For the most part, students became more articulate in expressing, and more skillful in implementing, the perspectives which they possessed in less developed forms at the beginning of the experience. The following description by one university supervisor of the development of one of

her students is typical of the perceptions of both university supervisors and cooperating teachers regarding changes in perspectives:

> I felt that she pretty much had her mind made up as to what she was going to do, how she was going to do things, and what she believed in. She was open to suggestions, but I felt she already had a pretty well established teacher identity. Her experience more or less solidified for her what she had already found out. [Interview with Ellen's supervisor]

As we analyzed and re-analyzed the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers, and our own observations and interviews with students regarding the issue of continuity/discontinuity, it became increasingly clear that the dominant trend was for teaching perspectives to develop and grow in a direction consistent with the "latent culture" that students brought to the experience.

Despite the lack of significant shifts in the substance of student teacher perspectives, there were several kinds of changes that did occur for most students. Generally, students came into the experience with fairly well defined "proto-perspectives" but lacked confidence and often lacked the skill to implement their preferred pedagogies effectively. Furthermore, although students came into student teaching with a background of two pre-student-teaching practicums, the shift to full-time status in a school as a student teacher resulted in a more realistic perception of the work of teaching and of the teacher's role.

> I really found out what it's like to give and give and give, and sometimes you feel that you're getting nothing in return. [Interview with Karen]

In addition to gaining a more realistic perception of the job of teaching, most student teachers grew increasingly comfortable with their initial positions, more confident in their abilities to handle a classroom in their preferred styles, and increasingly less fearful of the

potential threat posed by observations and evaluations of their teaching.

> In the beginning when my supervisor would come in, I would immediately think, "Well, what is he going to think of this activity." But toward the end I just thought, "Well, this is what I am teaching," And I didn't change anything. I kind of felt "this is the way I am and I can't help it if we don't think alike." [Interview with Grace]

This growing confidence and the development of teaching perspectives in a direction consistent with the latent culture brought to the experience describes 10 of the 13 students. Three students whose perspectives did not develop along the lines that would be predicted from the latent perspectives that they brought to the experience, employed what Lacey (1977) has referred to as a strategy of "strategic compliance." Each of the students reacted strongly against the constraints posed by their placements, but because of the severe nature of the contraints and their status as student teachers they generally acted in ways demanded by their situations while maintaining strong private reservations about doing so. In these three cases, the behavioral conformity to situations which was in conflict with the students' entering perspectives was contradicted by the lack of an underlying value commitment. Teaching perspectives did not develop or change for these three students, and at the end of the semester their perspectives remained at essentially the same point that they were at the beginning.[3]

Next there is the important question of the relative influence of individual intent and institutional constraint on the perspectives of student teachers. On the one hand, there are some who suggest that student teachers respond in a willing fashion to whatever the situation

demands and who would deny that individual intentions make a substantial contribution to the perspectives of student teachers (e.g., Hoy & Rees, 1977). On the other hand, it is our belief after examining the data from the present study that individual intentions do matter (at least during student teaching) and that the classroom actions of student teachers are a result of a continual interplay between the intentions of individuals and institutional constraints. The actions of student teachers were not totally determined by the perspectives brought to the experience; nor were they totally determined by institutional imperatives.

There are several different kinds of evidence in our data that lend support to this view of student teacher socialization and that confirm the significance of individual intent. First of all, the student teachers in this particular program actively participated in the selection of their student teaching placements. During the semester prior to their student teaching, each student observed and talked with at least two potential cooperating teachers. Student teachers and cooperating teachers were required to reach a mutual agreement regarding a "match" before a placement was made final. Consequently, for the most part, students selected themselves into situations that would enable them to develop in the direction they desired, and many students rejected placements that did not offer them this opportunity.

Second, as students talked with both teachers and university personnel regarding their preferences for a classroom placement their experiences in two previous practicums helped give some direction to this process of identifying a classroom for student teaching. There is much evidence in our data that students consciously thought about their

previous field experiences during this process and that they purposefully selected themselves into particular kinds of settings.

> Last semester I was in a fifth-grade class where the teacher was, well, he thought that children learned best if they were in their seats and quiet. You go through every book page by page, answer all of the questions and take all of the standardized tests. . . . I guess I got to see that kids couldn't take it, and I couldn't take it, being so structured. I wanted a classroom this semester where kids were more free to do what they want and where a lot of materials come from me or from a resource. [Interview with Debbie]

Finally, there was also evidence in each case that students were able to control, or at least give some direction to, what they did as student teachers. Egan's (1982) case study analysis of three of the 13 students demonstrates how diverse perspectives existed even in a single school. Despite the common and relatively strong institutional constraints under which these students worked, they were still able to respond to their common situation in somewhat unique ways.[4]

In summary, it is our belief that individual intention and institutional constraint both played significant roles in affecting the development of student teacher perspectives in the present study. Most student teachers purposefully selected themselves into situations where they would be able to act in certain ways and reacted somewhat uniquely to their situations even in the face of common institutional constraints. There is little evidence in our data that would support the kind of passive response to institutional forces that is frequently suggested in the literature (e.g., Hoy & Rees, 1977), nor an unthinking acquiescence to institutional demands.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest several directions for future research on student teacher socialization and for the conduct of student teaching programs. Our findings that student teachers for the most part were able to control the direction of their socialization and develop more elaborated versions of the perspectives which were evident at the beginning of the semester, are contrary to the conventional wisdom in the field and to the results of numerous studies which have indicated that student teachers' attitudes and perspectives are significantly altered during student teaching. More specifically, our findings generally support the position of Lortie (1975) and others who argue that student teaching plays little part in altering the course set by anticipatory socialization and challenge the findings of Hoy and Rees (1977) and others who contend that student teaching exerts a powerful and homogenizing influence on relatively malleable student teachers. At the same time, our findings challenge Lortie's (1975) position by supporting a view of student teacher socialization as a more negotiated and interactive process where what students bring to the experience gives direction to, but does not totally determine the outcome of the socialization process.

As is the case with any research of this kind, findings related to the socialization of student teachers cannot be interpreted apart from consideration of the nature of the student teaching program which provides the context for the investigation. As Gaskill (1975) points out, one cannot assume that all student teaching programs pose the same constraints and encouragements for students and that the socialization

of student teachers takes the same form and has the same meaning in different institutions. The substance of particular student teaching programs (e.g., forms of supervision, expectations and requirements for students); the characteristics of specific placement sites (Becher & Ade, 1982); and the place of student teaching in the overall preservice preparation program all necessarily affect the form and outcomes of student teacher socialization.

In the program studied here, students had opportunities to give direction to their experience both before and after the placement process was completed. For example, field requirements for student teachers and the specific expectations for their performance were largely determined individually for each student through a formal process of negotiation ("Letter of Expectations") at the beginning of the semester involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor (see Grant, 1975). The university prescribed very few requirements that all student teachers were expected to fulfill and encouraged students to take active roles in determining the specific form and substance of their student teaching. The university's stance toward program content as "reflexive" rather than as "received" (Zeichner, 1983) was consistent with the students' active roles in the placement process and probably contributed to some extent to the resilience of student teachers during the 15-week semester.

The nature of supervision in this program also encouraged students to clarify their perspectives toward teaching and, probably, to develop in a direction consistent with their entering perspectives. The weekly student teaching seminars with supervisors, the "inquiry-oriented" field assignments that students were required to complete, and the student

teacher journals which formed an essential part of the supervisory process generally encouraged greater clarity about the substance of teaching perspectives and a reflective or analytic stance toward teaching practice and pushed students to employ personal discretion and independent judgment in their work (see Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). All of this suggests that under certain conditions it may be possible to help student teachers control their situations rather than being passively controlled by them.

The question of which specific dimensions of student teaching programs are related to particular socialization outcomes clearly needs further investigation. While, for a variety of reasons, the present study has not singled out any specific programmatic components that were the crucial determinants in the socialization outcomes which were discovered, it does underline the inappropriateness of viewing the student teaching experience as a unitary entity unrelated to specific program content and contextual factors which exist in particular institutions. The question of the impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teachers should clearly be recast in the future as one where attempts are made to link specific dimensions of programs and contextual factors to socialization outcomes. It is not a question of whether Lortie's (1975) analysis is more accurate than that of Hoy and Rees (1977) or our own for student teaching in general. All of these explanations are probably correct in some situations and with some people. The challenge that lies ahead is to understand more about student teacher socialization in different contexts and for different students.

References

Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Becher, R., & Ade, W. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. Journal of Teacher Education, 33, 24-30.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen, 1981.

Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. (1977). Becoming professional. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Copeland, W. (1980). Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 18, 194-199.

Dale, R. (1977). Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Egan, K. B. (1982, March). The power of personal context in making students teachers: Three cases. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (in press). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), The third handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gaskill, P. (1975). Patterns and changes in the perspectives of student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Gibson, R. (1976). The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 2, 241-250.

Grant, C. (1975, December). The role of the letter of expectations in facilitating communication in the student teaching triad. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Educational Research Association, Madison, Wisconsin.

Haslam, M. (1971). An analysis of the development of perspectives toward teaching among student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Hoy, W., & Rees, W. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 23-26.

Iannaccone, L. (1963). Student teaching: A transitional stage on the making of a teacher. Theory into Practice, 2, 73-80.

Janesick, V. (1978). An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom perspective (Research Series No. 33). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Keddie, N. (1971). Classroom knowledge. In M. Young (Ed.). Knowledge and control. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lortie, S. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maddox, H. (1968). A descriptive study of teaching practice. Educational Review, 20, 177-180.

Mardle, G., & Walker, M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In Peter Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. (1980). Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 6, 51-61.

Popkewitz, T. (1979, April). Teacher education: Ideology or social mission? A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B. R., & Wehlage, G. (1981). The myth of educational reform. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Romberg, T., & Fox, G. T. (1976, September). Problems in analyzing dynamic events in teacher education. Madison, Wisconsin: USOE/Teacher Corps.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. (1975). Education and social control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Silvernail, D., & Costello, M. (1983). The impact of student teaching and internship programs on preservice teachers' pupil control perspectives, anxiety levels, and teaching concerns. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 32-36.

Stephens, J. (1967). The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Tabachnick, B. (1976). Describing dynamic events within teacher education (Technical Report No. 19). In Evaluating teacher education, 1975 CMTI Impact Study. Madison: USOE/Teacher Corps.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., Egan. (1982). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. (1967). The childhood romance theory of teacher development. School Review, 75, 123-154.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 3-9.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin (Ed.), The first years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin, Texas: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. (1984, January). The ecology of field experience. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Zeichner, K., & Grant, C. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1, 298-314.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 7-11.

Zeichner K., & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8, 95-117.

Notes

[1]This instrument and the profiles of each of the 13 students based on their responses to the TBI are included in the complete report of the study (Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982).

[2]Because of this we decided to drop the categories "The Role of the School in Society" and "The Role of the Community in School Affairs" from our analysis and based our descriptions of student teacher perspectives on the data related to the four remaining categories of perspectives.

[3]While space does not permit documentation of the existence of this "strategic compliance" or the internalized adjustment and development which characterized the majority of students, further documentation of these socialization "outcomes" can be found in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982).

[4]See Zeichner (1983) for a detailed analysis of the specific agents and institutional mechanisms which influenced the socialization of the 13 students.

Table 1

FOUR STUDENT TEACHER PROFILES BASED ON DOMINANT MODES OF RESOLVING EIGHTEEN DILEMMAS OF TEACHING*

Dilemmas	Emily	Marilyn	Donna	Constance
Knowledge and Curriculum				
1. Public knowledge--Personal knowledge	Public	Public	Public-Personal**	Public-Personal**
2. Knowledge is product--Knowledge is process	Product	Product	Product-Process**	Product-Process**
3. Knowledge is certain--Knowledge is problematic	Certain	Certain	Problematic-Certain**	Problematic-Certain**
4. Learning is fragmented--Learning is holistic	Fragmented	Fragmented	Holistic	Holistic
5. Learning is unrelated--Learning is integrated	Unrelated	Unrelated	Integrated	Integrated
6. Learning is individual--Learning is collective	Individual	Individual	Individual	Individual-Collective**
7. Teacher control over pupil learning: High--Low	High	High	Low	Low
Teacher-Pupil Relationships				
8. Distant--Personal	Distant	Personal	Personal	Personal
9. Teacher control over pupil behavior: High--Low	High	Low	Low	Low
The Teacher's Role				
10. In determining what to teach: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent	Bureaucratic	Bureaucratic	Functional	Functional
11. In determining how to teach: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent	Functional	Functional	Functional	Functional
12. In relation to school rules and regulations: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent	Bureaucratic	Functional	Functional	Functional

Table 1 (Continued)

Dilemmas	Emily	Marilyn	Donna	Constance
Student Diversity				
13. Children as members of a category--Children as unique	Category	Unique	Unique	Unique
14. School curriculum: Universalism--Particularism	Universalism	Universalism	Universalism	Particularism
15. Pupil behavior: Universalism--Particularism	Universalism	Particularism	Particularism	Particularism
16. Allocation of school resources: Equal--Differential	Equal	Equal	Differential	Differential
17. School curriculum: Emphasis on common culture--emphasis on subgroup consciousness	Common culture	Subgroup consciousness	Common culture	Subgroup consciousness
18. Career orientation: Restricted--Little restriction	Restricted	Restricted	Restricted	Little restriction

*The operational definitions for the 18 dilemmas are presented in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982).

**The designation of a student teacher's perspective in a particular area represents her dominant mode of resolving a dilemma. The notations for dilemmas as public-personal, product-process, problematic-certain, individual-collective indicate a resolution that includes both poles of these dilemmas.

SECTION III

Phase II: The Study of the First Year of Teaching

SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS[1]

Kenneth M. Zeichner
B. Robert Tabachnick
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 1984.

SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS[1]

Abstract

This paper reports the findings of a two-year longitudinal study of the development of teaching perspectives by four beginning teachers and examines: (1) the individual responses of the four teachers to the institutional contexts in which they worked; (2) the nature of the formal control mechanisms which existed in their schools. An elaborated version of Lacey's (1977) construct of "social strategy" is employed to describe the quality of individual responses to institutional pressures. An adaptation of Edwards' (1979) framework of "institutional control mechanisms" is utilized as a heuristic device for examining formal attempts within the schools to direct the actions of the teachers. The findings describe the nature of each teacher's development from the beginning of student teaching until the end of their first year of teaching and raise questions about the commonly accepted view of an inevitable loss of idealism during induction into teaching.

SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF BEGINNING TEACHERS[1]

The Problem

It is conventional to think of beginning teachers as vulnerable and unformed. They are expected to be unable to resist pressures to conform to institutional norms for teacher behavior. Willingly or unwillingly, beginning teachers are seen to be cajoled and molded into shapes acceptable within their schools.

Hanson and Herrington (1976, pp. 61-62), in their study of probationary teachers in England, conclude:

> The only way apparently open to probationers was to conform to the conventional wisdom and recipe knowledge of those around them . . . . What teachers are doing is learned in school, and if in college there is some consideration of what teachers should be doing, it is not sustained.

Despite the existence of much empirical evidence which would support this view and which demonstrates the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of institutional forces, studies also exist which demonstrate a resilience and firmness of beginning teachers under pressures to change.

On the one hand, it has been shown in studies of both elementary and secondary teachers in several countries that beginning teachers experience statistically significant shifts in many kinds of attitudes during their first year. For example, beginning teachers have been shown to shift in an authoritarian direction in their attitudes toward pupils as measured by the MTAI (e.g., Day, 1959; Ligana, 1970); to shift their attitudes related to autonomy in the teacher's role toward those held by significant evaluators (Edgar & Warren, 1969); to become more

custodial in their attitudes toward pupil control (e.g., Hoy, 1968; McArthur, 1978); to feel that they possess less knowledge about teaching at the end than at the beginning of the first year (e.g., Goode, 1978); to shift from progressive to more conventional teaching perspectives (e.g., Hanson & Herrington, 1976); and to rate themselves as less happy and inspiring at the end of the first year than at the beginning (e.g., Wright & Tuska, 1968). Almost all of these studies suggest that there is a loss of idealism during the first year and point to the notion of "reality shock" as a fact of life for first-year teachers. Lacey (1977, p. 48) summarizes the impression given by much of this research as follows:

> The major findings of this research underlines the importance of discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching. The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as they establish themselves in the profession away from the liberal ideas of their student days toward the traditional patterns in many schools.

Although there is much empirical research which supports the view that attitudes evidenced at the end of student teaching are abandoned by the end of the first year, there is also research which demonstrates a great deal of stability between student teaching and the end of the first year. Many, such as Bartholomew (1976), Giroux (1980), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) have challenged the commonly accepted view that the socializing impact of the university is liberalizing and that the socializing influence of the workplace is conservative in relation to the university's influence.[2] Furthermore, empirical studies such as those conducted by Power (1981) and Petty and Hogben (1980) in Australia and by Mardle and Walker (1980) in England support this hesitancy to accept the view of an inevitable "progressive-traditional" shift in teaching perspectives during the first year and

demonstrate that certain attitudes of beginning teachers appear to be resistant to changes. Power (1981, p. 213) conveys the impression given by this set of studies when he concludes:

> The present evidence calls into question the pessimistic statements about reality shock for beginning teachers. If the conditions described by Dreeben (1970) . . . existed in this study and had the impact they suggested, it is difficult to believe that the influence would not be reflected in teachers' perceptions of themselves in the teaching role, in their evaluation of teaching as an occupational activity or in their vocational interests and aspirations, even at the group level. But no such evidence appeared in the present data. It can be speculated that teacher training has a greater impact on the professional socialization of teachers than has been realized.

Others, such as Petty and Hogben (1980), Mardle and Walker (1980), and Goodlad (1982), also call into question the notion of reality shock, but see anticipatory socialization as the most significant influence on teacher development.

> Indeed preservice experience may be more profoundly influential than either the efficacy of training or the colleague control of later years . . . . Teachers do not become resocialized during their course of training nor in the reality of the classroom, since in essence this is a reality which they never actually left. (Mardle & Walker, 1980, pp. 99, 103)

It should be noted that in <u>both</u> groups of studies, those that demonstrate changes and those which do not, some teachers experienced significant shifts in attitudes while others did not. Furthermore, among those who changed, the changes were often in different directions. The conclusions of all of these researchers regarding continuity or discontinuity between student teaching and the end of the first year have been based in each instance on central tendencies of the groups of teachers studied, particularly shifts in mean scores on attitude measures.[3] For example, despite his challenge to the notion of reality shock for beginning teachers, Power (1981, p. 290) concludes:

> The results show the transition from student teacher to teacher to be characterized by remarkable stability . . . . It can be seen that as a group, the sample revealed no significant change in perception of self in the teaching role . . . . At the same time . . . while there is group stability, there is considerable systematic individual change . . . . There was little or no change for the majority of subjects, but there were some subjects whose scores changed moderately to substantially in one or the other direction.

In the final analysis when attention is focused on the socialization of individual beginning teachers, neither group of studies is very helpful in illuminating how specific beginning teachers are socialized in particular settings. We are almost never given specific information in these studies about the personal characteristics and life histories of the teachers or detailed information about the settings in which they work. On the one hand, first-year teachers are seen as prisoners of the past (either anticipatory socialization or preservice training), and on the other hand they are seen as prisoners of the present (institutional pressures emanating from the workplace). Significantly, in neither case are beginning teachers viewed as making any substantial contributions to the quality or strength of their own induction into teaching.

We would like to suggest, along with Lacey (1977), Pollard (1982), and Feiman-Nemser and Floden (in press), that neither of these views is very helpful in understanding beginning teacher socialization; that conformity (to the past or present) is not the only outcome of induction; and that even when conformity does occur, it occurs in different degrees, in different forms, has different meanings for different individual teachers and within different institutional contexts.

The present paper will draw upon data from a two-year longitudinal study of four beginning teachers and will examine: (1) the degree to which (and under what conditions) these beginning teachers adopted or failed to adopt the cultures and traditions of their workplaces; and (2) the extent to which (and under what conditions) these beginning teachers abandoned or maintained teaching perspectives brought to the first year of teaching. Somewhat more generally, our concern is with understanding the interplay of individual intent and institutional constraint during entry into the teaching role; the ways in which institutions are shaped by new teachers and in which the new teachers are shaped by the institutions.

Given the view of many researchers (e.g., Ryan, 1970; Tisher, 1982) that the induction of beginning teachers is highly context specific, related in each instance to unique interactions of persons (who possess varying levels of skills and capabilities) and school contexts (which differ in the constraints and opportunities for action they present to beginning teachers), it becomes necessary to study how specific beginning teachers are inducted into particular school contexts before attempting to formulate generalizations about the processes of entry into the teaching role. The alternative strategy of describing central tendencies in groups of beginning teachers while assuming school contexts to be relatively homogeneous tends to obscure important differences among teachers and among schools and has generally failed to illuminate the subtle processes of beginning teacher socialization.

Studying the Development of Perspectives

We began in the spring of 1981 by studying the impact of the elementary student teaching experience at one large state university in the United States on the development of teaching perspectives by 13 student teachers. The selection of these 13 students gave us a representative sample from this particular program of teaching ideologies and classroom contexts (including different school organizational structures, grade levels, and school/community demographic characteristics).[4] Teaching perspectives were defined according to Becker et al.'s (1961) definition used in Boys in White as:

> A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective. Similarly, the ideas can be seen by an observer to be one of the possible sets of ideas which might form the underlying rationale for the person's actions and are seen by the actor as providing a justification for acting as he does. (p. 34)

According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes since they include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, unlike values, perspectives are specific to situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies. During this first phase of our work, we sought to identify the teaching perspectives of the 13 student teachers in relation to four specific domains (knowledge and curriculum, the teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships, and student diversity) and to identify any changes which took place in the perspectives of the students during the 15-week semester. We also sought to identify the various individual and institutional factors that

were related to the development of perspectives toward teaching. During this semester we interviewed each student a minimum of five times, observed them while teaching a minimum of three times, interviewed their cooperating teachers and university supervisors, examined journals kept by the students, and examined transcripts of their weekly student teaching seminars.

During the 1981-82 school year, we followed four of the original group of 13 individuals into their first year of teaching and asked two questions related to the general theme of teacher development: (1) How were the teaching perspectives, evidenced at the end of student teaching, strengthened or modified during the first year? Here, we wanted to describe the continuities and discontinuities between the socializing conditions of student teaching and those of the workplace during the first year. (2) Who and what influenced the development of teacher perspectives during the first year? Here, we were interested in identifying the personal characteristics of the beginning teachers and the characteristics of the institutions in which they worked that appeared to encourage resistance to or compliance with particular institutional pressures regarding teaching. We explored how and from whom these teachers learned about institutional norms and the extent to which these teachers adapted to the existing institutional regularities in their schools. We also explored whether and how the "institution" attempted to monitor and elicit compliance with particular institutional norms.

During this second phase of our work, we continued to use the four orienting categories of teacher perspectives to describe teacher actions and ideas. Each of the four orienting categories was further defined in terms of several specific "dilemmas" of teaching which had emerged from

analyses of the data in the first phase of the study. Table 1 identifies the 18 dilemmas of teaching that were associated with the four orienting categories. These 18 dilemmas gave direction to our data collection efforts during the second phase of the study.[5]

Insert Table 1 about here

Between August, 1981, and May, 1982, we spent three one-week periods in the schools of each of the four teachers. A specific research plan was followed during each of the three weeks of data collection. During four days of each week, an observer constructed narrative descriptions of events in each classroom using the four orienting categories and related "dilemmas" as an orienting framework. All of the teachers were interviewed several times each day regarding their plans for instruction (e.g., purposes and rationales for particular activities) and their reactions to what had occurred. One day each week, an observer constructed a narrative description of classroom events with a particular focus on six pupils in each classroom who had been selected to represent the range of student diversity that existed in each classroom.

In addition to the daily interviews with each teacher that focused on particular events that had been observed, a minimum of two in-depth interviews were conducted with each teacher during each of the three data collection periods. These interviews sought in part to explore teachers' views regarding their own professional development in relation to the four orienting categories of perspectives and also addressed

additional dimensions of perspectives unique to each teacher which had emerged during the second phase of the study. Finally, the six "target" pupils in each classroom were interviewed individually once during each data collection period to enable us to determine how classroom life was experienced by individual pupils. These pupil interviews enabled us to confirm or disconfirm our own observations of how pupils reacted to classroom events and to check the accuracy of teacher statements regarding how time was spent in the classroom during the weeks that we were not present. Through the classroom observations and teacher and pupil interviews, we sought to monitor the continuing development of teacher perspectives and to construct in-depth portraits of life in each of the four classrooms. Additionally, we sought to investigate the influence of several social context variables on the development of teacher perspectives: (1) school ethos and tradition; (2) teacher culture; (3) student culture; (4) parental expectations; (5) school demographic characteristics; and (6) material constraints on teachers' work such as curriculum guidelines. During the two in-depth interviews that were held within each of the data collection periods, we asked each of the four teachers about their perceptions of the constraints and encouragements in their schools and about how they learned what was and was not acceptable behavior for teachers in their particular situations. We were particularly interested in the degree to which each teacher felt she was free to employ initiative and independent judgment in her work and the extent to which each teacher felt she had to conform to the expectations of others with respect to what to teach, how to teach, and how to organize and manage her classroom.

We also interviewed each principal at least once and interviewed two teachers in each school concerning their views of institutional pressures (e.g., constraints and encouragements). We collected many kinds of formal documents in each school such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks. Tape-recorded interviews with teachers, pupils, and principals and classroom observations were transcribed to facilitate a content analysis of the data. Several analyses of the data conducted from May, 1982, to March, 1983, led to the construction of four case studies which describe the journeys of each teacher and the individual and social influences on their development from the beginning of student teaching to the end of the first year.[6]

The four teachers, who were all women, worked in a variety of settings: (1) one in an urban, one in a rural, and two in suburban schools; (2) in schools that served very different kinds of communities (e.g., one school served children of upper-middle-class professionals and managers, a second school served children of industrial workers, etc.). Three teachers worked in self-contained classroom settings with minimal departmentalization, while the fourth teacher worked in an architecturally open-plan school with total departmentalization within teaching teams. Three were the only first-year teachers in their respective buildings, while one teacher had ready access to other beginners. Two were the only teachers at their respective grade levels, while two teachers worked with other teachers who taught the same grade or, in one case, the same pupils. Three of the four teachers taught at the seventh- or eighth-grade level and one teacher taught at the fourth-grade level. All of the teachers left the university with fairly similar teaching perspectives, according to our original typology (see

Tabachnick, Zeichner, et al., 1982). Three of the teachers worked in settings very different from those they experienced as student teachers. Table 2 summarizes selected characteristics of the settings that the four individuals worked in as student teachers and as first-year teachers.

Insert Table 2 about here

The Social Strategies of Beginning Teachers

We found a conceptual framework developed by Colin Lacey (1977) to be very useful in helping us understand the degree to which the four teachers conformed to institutional norms and the extent to which they either abandoned or maintained teaching perspectives brought to the first year. Lacey (1977) challenges Becker's (1964) notion of "situational adjustment" (i.e., "the individual turns himself into the kind of person the situation demands") as the only possible outcome of occupational socialization and proposes the construct of <u>social strategy</u> as a heuristic device for understanding how and to what degree beginning teachers are socialized into their roles. Lacey's framework rests on the important distinction (also drawn by Rosow, 1965) between socialization in terms of value commitment and behavioral conformity.

Lacey (1977, pp. 67-68) defines a <u>social strategy</u> as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific situations. He then identifies three distinct strategies that he claims are employed by prospective teachers in the face of institutional constraints. First,

internalized adjustment refers to a response where individuals comply with the authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, strategic compliance refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs, and conformity is essentially an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of strategic redefinition refers to those situations where successful attempts to change are made by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and to introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.

Student Teaching

Our research provides support for an interactive view of teacher socialization, in which individual intent and institutional constraint both play a role in affecting a beginning teacher's entry into the teaching role. Although all 13 student teachers in Phase I of the study engaged in each of the three social strategies at various times during the semester in relation to particular aspects of their experience, it was possible to identify a dominant social strategy which was employed by each student. As has been reported elsewhere in greater detail (Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982), 10 of the 13 students responded

during student teaching with a dominant strategy of internalized adjustment. The meaning of this response, however, was very different for these students than the usual meaning of conforming to pressure or passive acceptance of an institutionally approved perspective.

First, each of the 10 participated actively in selecting a student teaching placement and several had initially rejected placements that did not appear to them to conform to their own image of a classroom compatible with their perspectives toward teaching. On the other hand, all of these students purposefully sought to select themselves into particular kinds of settings and often consciously thought about their previous field experiences in the process:

> Last semester I was in a fifth-grade class where the teacher was, well, he thought that children learned best if they were in their seats and quiet. You go through every book page by page, answer all of the questions, and take all of the standardized tests. . . . I guess I got to see that kids couldn't take it, and I couldn't take it being so structured. I wanted a classroom this semester where kids were more free to do what they want and where a lot of materials come from me or from a resource. [Interview with Debbie]

For the most part, these 10 students became more articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the teaching perspectives which they possessed in less developed forms at the beginning of the semester. They willingly complied to the institutional norms in their classrooms and to the directives of their cooperating teachers, but they had deliberately chosen classrooms which would enable them to act in these ways. Furthermore, Egan's (1982) case study analysis of three of these students who were all placed in the same school demonstrates that even under common institutional constraints students react somewhat uniquely to similar situations. Thus, even with regard to those who employed internalized adjustment as their dominant social strategy,

there is little evidence in the data which would support the kind of passive response to institutional forces that is frequently suggested in the literature.

The dominant social strategy of the remaining three students was one of strategic compliance. Each of these individuals for different reasons reacted strongly against the constraints posed in their schools and/or by the university, but because of the nature of the constraints and because of their low status as student teachers, they generally acted in ways demanded by their situations while maintaining strong private reservations about doing so.[7]

For example, Hannah openly questioned from the very beginning of her student-teacher experience the departmentalized organizational structure of her school, the rationalized and standardized curriculum (where objectives, content, and materials were largely predetermined), and the distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils which were part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school. However, feeling alone and getting constant pressure from her colleagues and pupils to conform to the dominant culture of her school, Hannah made a conscious decision by the end of the sixth week of her experience to comply strategically with the accepted way of life in her school. From the seventh week on, Hannah stuck more closely to the required curriculum and kept her discontent to herself. Throughout the semester, our own observations, Hannah's statements, and the comments from her cooperating teacher and university supervisor strongly confirmed that Hannah's compromises after the sixth week represented only behavioral conformity without an underlying value commitment. Because Hannah was not able to get the guidance that she desired as a student teacher, she

was not able to develop (as did Rachel, Sarah, and Beth) the skills and strategies necessary for realizing her goals. Hannah reacted strongly against becoming the kind of teacher she saw around her, but did not develop well articulated perspectives consistent with her own vision of teaching.

The First Year of Teaching

In the second phase of the study we find further support for an interactive view of teacher socialization. We found it necessary, however, to elaborate Lacey's (1977) conceptual framework during this phase to account for the two different institutional contexts which each teacher had experienced. Although we retained Lacey's (1977) categories of internalized adjustment, strategic compliance, and strategic redefinition, we added a contextual factor to the definition of each social strategy which considered the overall similarity or dissimilarity between the institutional contexts experienced during student teaching and the first year. For example, the two cases of internalized adjustment in our sample were distinguished from one another because one teacher had adjusted to a school situation very much like her school during student teaching, while the other teacher adjusted to a very different situation. The implications of this additional dimension are important for understanding the development of teacher perspectives over time.

A second elaboration of Lacey's conceptual framework broadens the meaning of strategic redefinition or, at least, describes a dimension of its meaning which is not explicit in Lacey's discussion. While Lacey (1977) seems to reserve this term for only those attempts at redefinition which are successful, we broadened the definition of

"strategic redefinition" to include both those attempts which were successful and those which were not. In this way the framework can account for all instances of overt deviance. Obviously, one cannot determine which of the two types of strategic redefinition has occurred until the process has been completed. Furthermore, each of the two varieties of strategic redefinition may lead to different actions. For example, if an individual fails in a change attempt, he/she may choose to leave the organization or to engage in one of the two strategies of situational adjustment. On the other hand, if the attempt is successful, the behavior might now fall within the range of acceptable responses within the institution.

Table 3 summarizes the eight possible social strategies within this elaborated version of Lacey's (1977) model when the differences between successful and unsuccessful strategic redefinition are also taken into account.

Insert Table 3 about here

As was the case during student teaching, each of the four individuals engaged in each of the social strategies at various times during their first year of teaching in relation to particular aspects of their work. All teachers maintained internal doubts about some of their actions during the year and all were fully committed to other aspects of their work. Finally, all of the teachers engaged in some form of strategic redefinition and introduced at least some new and creative elements into their schools. However, despite the variety of strategies

employed by each teacher, there was also a dominant strategy which characterized the experience of each teacher.

Specifically, two of the four teachers (Hannah and Rachel) who were both in "dissimilar situations" attempted to redefine significantly the range of acceptable behaviors in their schools in various ways (e.g., in relation to teacher-pupil relationships, the curriculum), while the other two teachers (Beth and Sarah) experienced adjustment to the dominant norms in their schools in terms of both values and behaviors. Sarah, who was in a situation very similar to her school during student teaching, was able to continue to develop her teaching perspectives in a manner consistent with her development during student teaching. On the other hand, Beth, who taught in a school very different from the one that she had worked in as a student teacher, appeared to shift away from her entering perspectives toward perspectives which were consistent with those encouraged by the dominant formal and informal cultures in her new school. Beth was the only one of the four teachers who appeared to "give up" perspectives which seemed clearly developed (they were certainly clearly articulated) by the end of student teaching, and both her actions and statements indicated that this shift was one of internalized adjustment.

Hannah, one of the two students whose dominant strategy was one of strategic redefinition, was successful in her efforts even under strong pressures to conform, while the other teacher, Rachel, failed for various reasons in her efforts to establish her "dominant" teaching style. There were many reasons why attempts at strategic redefinition either failed or succeeded. Among these were the degree to which teaching perspectives were developed at the beginning of the year and

the strength with which they were held, the "coping skills" and political sensitivity of the teachers, the degree of contradiction between formal and informal school cultures, and the reactions of the pupils to the teachers. We were particularly impressed with the tenacity with which both Rachel and Hannah clung to their entering perspectives under strong pressures to change and with the key role played by pupil responses in strengthening or modifying these perspectives. (See Appendix A)

Table 4 summarizes the dominant social strategies employed by all four of the teachers during student teaching and the first year. Without going into detail here about the combinations of specific factors in each case that led to the adoption of a particular social strategy or to its success or failure,[8] we feel that this study clearly demonstrates that the adaptation of beginning teachers to institutional regularities cannot be taken for granted and that first-year teachers, under some conditions at least, can have a creative impact on their workplaces and survive.[9]

Insert Table 4 about here

These findings also call into question the definition of teaching perspectives as situationally specific. Despite the fact that three of the four teachers worked in very different situations as first-year teachers than as student teachers (different in terms of the kinds of constraints and possibilities they presented teachers, different in terms of school traditions and cultures), two of these three teachers

attempted to implement a style of pedagogy similar to that which was evidenced during student teaching. Only one teacher (Beth) significantly changed her perspectives in response to differing institutional demands. Although Sarah talks about having to follow the textbook more and about feeling less in control of her classroom as a first-year teacher, she found herself in a situation very similar to that experienced as a student teacher and continued to develop her perspectives in a manner consistent with her initial predispositions.

In summary, despite differing institutional contexts during student teaching and the first year, beginning teachers under some conditions at least were able to maintain a perspective which was in conflict with the dominant institutional cultures in their schools. One possible explanation for the resilience of beginning teachers in the face of institutional pressure is that the pressure of the institution is often contradictory in nature. Despite arguments by Hoy (1968) and others that there is a homogeneous school culture into which neophytes are socialized, we found, consistent with the studies of Carew and Lightfoot (1979), Metz ((1978), and Hammersley (1977), that school cultures were often diverse, that various "subcultures" were easily identifiable in all but one school, and that these subcultures at times attempted to influence the beginning teachers in contradictory ways. In the one case where a teacher was able to redefine various aspects of her school situation successfully, these contradictions within the school culture (particularly contradictions between the formal and informal school cultures) played a significant role in enabling Hannah to implement successfully a style of teaching which was very different from that which went on around her. However, in the one case of unsuccessful

strategic redefinition, a very strong and homogeneous school culture in opposition to the teacher's preferred style played a significant role in blocking Rachel's efforts to succeed in a manner consistent with her initial predispositions. School cultures are apparently not always diverse and contradictory within any one setting, but when they are, the contradictions seem to provide room for beginning teachers to implement a "deviant" pedagogy, or at least to establish individual expressions of teaching. In any case, whatever the explanation, it seems clear the beginning teachers give some direction to the strength and quality of their socialization into teaching. There is very little evidence in our data which would support the kind of ready acquiescence to institutional demands which has been described frequently in both the literature of student teaching (Gibson, 1976) and teaching (Schwille et al., 1979).

Institutional Control and the Socialization of Beginning Teachers

The second interest in our study was to discover how the particular characteristics, dispositions, and abilities of the beginning teachers and the various people and institutional characteristics in their schools influenced the development of teaching perspectives during the first year. There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature with regard to the potency and influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms that affect the development of beginning teachers. Studies exist which emphasize the socializing role of more experienced colleagues (e.g., Eddy, 1969; Newberry, 1977); pupils (e.g., Haller, 1967; Applegate et al., 1977) sanctioning colleagues such as principals (e.g., Edgar & Warren, 1969); the ecological characteristics of

classrooms (e.g., Doyle, 1979; Denscombe, 1982); the structural characteristics of schools and the teacher's work (e.g., Dreeben, 1970; Dale, 1977); and the influence of persons in lateral roles, and "nonprofessional" factors (e.g., Johnston & Ryan, 1983). Evidence also exists that beginning teachers learn how to teach in the isolation of their own classrooms (e.g., Lortie, 1966) and that they frequently draw upon models of teaching which were internalized during pupilhood (e.g., Lortie, 1975) and on their own human tendencies to teach others (e.g., Stephens, 1967). Finally, evidence also exists that what beginning teachers bring to their work (e.g., potential abilities) and who they are as people significantly affect the nature of their adaptation to the workplace during their first year (e.g., McDonald, 1980; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983).

Lortie (1973, p. 488) states that the socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a single factor frame of reference." He calls for studies which assess the relative contributions of several agents or mechanisms under particular conditions. Zeichner (1983) presents an analysis of the influence of a variety of people and factors on the socialization of the four beginning teachers in this study. The present paper will focus on one specific aspect of the influence process, how particular institutional structures within the four schools affected the work of the beginning teachers.

Fenstermacher (1980) has argued that teachers' experiences with the institutional characteristics of schools are the most potent determinants of their intentions and that these intentions (motives, plans, and deliberative choices) are significant determinants of their actions in classrooms. He hypothesizes further that the institutional

characteristics of schools experienced during induction are more powerful determinants than experiences gained during any other span of time during a career. In a similar vein, Dreeben (1970, 1973) has written extensively about how certain organizational properties of schools have implications for the character of teachers' work. Dreeben's thesis is that certain structural properties of schools such as their internal spatial arrangement (e.g., egg crate vs. open plan), modes of affiliation (e.g., hired vs. conscripted), and authority relations (e.g., between teachers and pupils) shape the character of teachers' work activities and that teachers' work can be construed as an adaptive response to the problems and dilemmas posed by this work context. There are many others of various theoretical persuasions (e.g., Larkin, 1973; Denscombe, 1980; Harris, 1982; Pollard, 1982; Freedman et al., 1983) who have described how particular institutional characteristics of schools by themselves or as mediators of influence from the larger social, political, and economic context affect the character of teachers' work.

Despite all of these attempts to conceptualize school structure and to examine the classroom actions of teachers in relation to specific institutional characteristics, Schlechty (1976, p. 83) has concluded, "there currently exists no adequate description or formulation of the structural characteristics of schools." What we have, according to Schlechty, is a variety of different lenses for viewing these structural characteristics which reflects the variety of sociological paradigms and theoretical frameworks which have been employed in the study of schools as organizations. While we agree with Schlechty about the wide variety of conceptualizations within this literature, we also see

certain commonalities among studies in this area, the most striking of which is the way in which bureaucratic theories have served as the "ground" in analyses of school structure.

In our view, much of the discussion in the educational literature on the structural characteristics of schools has revolved around the question of the heuristic value of the bureaucratic template for providing an understanding of how influence is exerted in schools and how teachers are socialized into their roles. For example, while those such as Hoy (1968) and McArthur (1978) have emphasized the value of bureaucratic theory in illuminating the structural dimensions of teacher socialization, others such as Weick (1976) and Meyer and Rowan (1978) have identified limitations in the potential in bureaucratic theories for helping us to understand the work of teachers. One common strategy in this literature is to examine school organizations in terms of the extent to which they reflect bureaucratic or professional expectations for teachers (e.g., Corwin, 1965). In most cases, whether the conclusion is that schools are "tightly coupled" or "loosely coupled" in relation to the teacher's work, the problem is framed within a bureaucratic-professional dichotomy, and the bureaucratic template serves as the referent for conclusions regarding the influence of school structure on teacher's work.

The present paper seeks to expand the scope of the analysis beyond exclusive reliance on the bureaucratic template as the "ground" for the analysis of school structure. In analyzing how a specific aspect of school structure, <u>institutional control mechanisms</u>, affected the work of the four teachers under study, we have adapted a theoretical framework of institutional control conceived outside of the school context and

have explored its potential for illuminating forms of institutional control within schools. This framework, while addressing the issue of bureaucratic control, goes beyond the bureaucratic template to consider a form of institutional control which has not typically been explored in relation to the problem of teacher socialization.

All institutions, and schools are no exception, employ mechanisms of control to exact greater productivity from workers and to try to ensure that organizational members follow accepted procedures within an organization. Etzioni (1965, p. 650) defines an organizational control structure as the "distribution of means used by an organization to elicit the performances it needs and to check whether the quantities and qualities of such performances are in accord with organizational specifications."[10] Richard Edwards (1979) identifies three different forms of organizational control in his analysis of the struggles of management and labor to exert control within the workplace. These three forms of institutional control (personal, bureaucratic, and technical) are defined in relation to three specific aspects of the work process: (1) the direction of work (e.g., the specification of what needs to be done, in what order, with what degree of precision, and in what period of time); (2) the evaluation of workers' performances (e.g., how work is supervised and how the performance of each worker is assessed); and (3) discipline (e.g., how workers are sanctioned and rewarded in attempts to elicit cooperation and enforce compliance with "management's" direction of the work process).

First, with personal or direct control, superordinates (which in the case of the school would be the principal) personally supervise the activities of workers and through close monitoring of workers' actions

ensure that workers comply with organizational norms. Secondly, with bureaucratic control, control is embedded into the social structure of the workplace and is enforced through impersonal bureaucratic rules and hierarchical social relations. Sanctions and rewards under bureaucratic control are dictated by officially approved policies to which workers, in particular role groups, are held responsible. Finally, with technical control, an organization's control over its members (direction of work tasks, evaluation of work done, and rewarding and disciplining of workers) is embedded into the physical structure of the labor process, and jobs are designed in such a way as to minimize the need for personal supervision by administrators and to minimize the need to rely on workers' compliance with impersonal bureaucratic rules.

This framework for examining various forms of organizational control was very helpful to us in understanding how the first-year teachers learned what was expected of them, how desired behaviors were reinforced, and how organizational sanctions were applied. Generally, we found that there was very little direct and close supervision of the first-year teachers by their principals (see Appendix A). Although all of the principals articulated expectations for what the teachers were supposed to teach and for how they should manage their classrooms, there was very little effort on the part of principals (with the exception of Beth's principal) to attempt to ensure teacher compliance by directly monitoring behaviors in the classroom. Furthermore, none of the four teachers looked to their principals for guidance and assistance on a regular basis.

On the other hand, as one would expect, there were numerous bureaucratic rules and regulations in each school which attempted to dictate

to teachers how and what to teach, procedures for managing pupil behavior in and out of the classroom, and such general activities as when teachers could leave the school building at the end of the day. We found that these bureaucratic rules and regulations (e.g., articulated in curriculum guides and teacher handbooks) gave the beginning teachers varying degrees of information about what was expected of them and of the limits beyond which organizational sanctions would be applied. We also found, consistent with Weick's (1976) notion of schools as "loosely coupled systems" and with Bidwell's (1965) construct of "structural looseness," that the first-year teachers were frequently able to ignore or even to openly violate bureaucratic rules when they wanted to do so. The self-contained classrooms in three of the four schools together with the minimal amount of personal supervision by principals in these three schools weakened the controlling effects of a bureaucratic organization. For example, despite a policy in her school that required teachers to grade pupils according to a standardized grading scheme based entirely on the percentage of correct responses, Hannah frequently raised the marks of her pupils when she thought that they had put their best effort into the work. There was minimal interaction among teachers in this school about classroom-related matters and the principal, who was also a full-time classroom teacher, did not have the time to personally supervise Hannah's activities in the classroom.

While the teachers complied with formal school rules and regulations on a regular basis, only Beth adopted a "bureaucratic perspective" toward her role as a teacher. In Beth's school there was considerable pressure on all teachers to conform to a perspective preferred by the administration and the majority of teachers. This pressure took the

form of the principal's more frequent supervision, though it was often casual and indirect; the bureaucratic organization into teaching teams, each team of teachers planning for and teaching 80 to 100 or more pupils; and pupil and teacher success judged by success on preset tests. There was some "slippage" even here, and some teachers resisted these constraints to some extent, though Beth did not. (See Appendix A for a more detailed description of Hannah's and Beth's school context.)

The most pervasive and powerful factor in determining the level of institutional constraints in all of the schools was technical control exerted through the timing of instruction, the curriculum and curricular materials, and the architecture of the school. Technical control reached through the walls into every teacher's classroom. It was most powerful for Beth, where the pace and form of instruction, the open architectural plan, the precise time schedules, and the performance-based curriculum all made deviation from the preferred patterns of teaching very difficult. While present as a factor in all the other schools, technical control was less complete, was not as strongly reinforced by other forms of control (direct supervision or strong bureaucratic structures), and was more easily manipulated or ignored by the teachers.

Apple (1983), Gitlin (1983), and Wise (1979) have recently argued, and have provided some empirical support, for the view that the technical control is a significant aspect of the way in which teachers are socialized into their work and of how institutional norms are maintained over time. Our research supports their arguments particularly with reference to Beth, and underlies the importance of examining how different forms of institutional control contribute to communicating

institutional expectations to teachers and to the monitoring and evaluation of teachers' work activities. No more than any other form of attempted institutional control, technical control does not constitute an irresistible pressure for teacher conformity. Even beginning teachers can manage to avoid or redirect elements of technical control if they have personal goals and the political skills to realize these. Technical control is an issue which has not received much attention in the literature to date and should be taken into account in future studies of beginning teacher socialization.

Finally, it should be pointed out that Edwards' (1979) conceptual framework did not provide a complete picture of how the four institutions sought to elicit compliance with particular norms regarding teaching. Specifically, while this framework illuminated important aspects of the <u>formal</u> institutional control structures, it did not enable us to address the influence of the "institutional bias" (Pollard, 1982)[11] in a school which was communicated to each beginning teacher through the <u>informal</u> teacher, pupil, and school cultures which were present in each setting. In addition to the formal control mechanisms which were operant in each school to varying degrees, we found at least one and sometimes several informal teacher, pupil, and school cultures which were often in conflict with officially sanctioned practices. It was the interaction of these formal and informal cultures rather than the presence or absence of any particular control mechanism by itself which determined the institutional constraints and opportunities presented to each teacher.

For example, in the one case where strategic redefinition was largely successful (Hannah), an informal school tradition to let each

teacher function on his or her own without interference from other teachers weakened the influence of formal attempts to coordinate curricular activities within the school and provided opportunities for Hannah to attempt to implement her preferred and "deviant" style of teaching. In the case where strategic redefinition was unsuccessful (Rachel), the lack of contradiction between the formal and informal school cultures made it very difficult for Rachel to find any support for her attempts to implement her "deviant" teaching style. (See Appendix A)

There were many factors which influenced the strength of the informal traditions within each school (e.g., the number of years a staff had worked together) and their impact on the four teachers (e.g, the degree to which pupils had internalized informal school traditions). There were also many factors in each instance which contributed to the success or failure of particular actions of the beginning teachers. Although a discussion of all of these influences is beyond the scope of this paper, it should be emphasized that an understanding of institutional control in the four schools cannot be derived from an analysis of formal control mechanisms alone.

Conclusion

This paper has reported selected findings from a two-year longitudinal study of the development of teaching perspectives by four beginning teachers. In doing so it has examined both the individual responses of the four teachers to the institutional contexts in which they worked and the nature of the formal control mechanisms which were employed in their schools in an attempt to elicit compliance with particular institutional norms. An elaborated version of Lacey's (1977)

construct of "social strategy" was employed to describe the quality of individual responses to institutional pressures. Edwards' (1979) conceptualization of "institutional control mechanisms" was utilized as a heuristic device for exploring formal attempts within the schools to direct the actions of the teachers.

The experience of only one of the four teachers (Beth) conformed to the commonly accepted scenario of a loss of idealism during the first year of teaching. Two of the teachers were able to maintain their initial perspectives even under pressures to change. One of these teachers (Hannah) was able significantly to redefine the range of acceptable behavior in her school by exploiting "openings" created by weak and contradictory efforts at institutional control. The other teacher (Rachel) tenaciously clung to her initial perspectives despite her largely unsuccessful efforts to change the institutional norms within her classroom. The fourth teacher (Sarah) continued on a course of development evidenced during student teaching. Although she saw herself to have become less idealistic, much of Sarah's initial idealism was maintained with the encouragement and support of those in her school.

It was also argued that the interaction among the three institutional control mechanisms and between these formal mechanisms and more informal modes of control rather than the presence or absence of any one particular form of control determined the institutional constraints and opportunities presented to each teacher. Although technical control was found to be a significant factor in all four schools (particularly so in Beth's), the issue of technical control, which has received little attention to date, needs to be examined in relation to other forms of

both formal and informal influence. The common assumption regarding the existence of one homogeneous culture into which all new teachers are socialized and of the lack of contradiction in institutional influence within a single school was not supported in this study.

While a detailed discussion of the specific individual and institutional factors related to each teacher's development during the first year was beyond the scope of this paper, it can be seen, even from the general outline of the findings presented here, that there is no one explanation which can describe the entry of beginning teachers into the teaching role. Despite the fact that these four teachers began their first year of teaching with fairly similar teaching perspectives, there were significant differences in both the teachers' abilities and desires to implement their perspectives and in the nature of the constraints and opportunities offered to teachers within each school. The journeys of these four teachers from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching must necessarily be viewed in a manner which accounts for both the uniqueness and commonality in their experiences. The widespread practice of describing only central tendencies in induction into teaching can not illuminate the diversity which characterized the induction of these four beginning teachers into the teaching role.

Finally, the most hopeful implication of this study is that a loss of idealism is not an inevitable result of induction into teaching and that the efforts of formal teacher preparation programs are not necessarily in vain. Under some conditions at least it appears possible for beginning teachers to find or to create opportunities for the expression of their ideals. How to create and maintain the conditions which will

enhance those individual expressions of teaching perspectives which are encouraged in our preparation programs is the challenge offered by the results of this research.

References

Apple, M. (1983). Curricular form and the logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Applegate, J. et al. (1977). The first-year teacher study. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 766).

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. (1962). Two faces of power. American Political Science Review, 56, 947-952.

Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & J. M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Becker, H. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 40-53.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social exchange. London: Methuen.

Bidwell, C. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. (1979). Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Corwin, R. (1965). A sociology of education. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Dale, R. (1977). Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Day, H. (1959). Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 10, 326-328.

Denscombe, M. (1980). The work context of teaching: An analytic framework for the study of teachers in classrooms. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 1, 279-292.

Denscombe, M. (1982). The hidden pedagogy and its implication for teacher training. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 3, 249-265.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. Theory into Practice, 18, 138-144.

Dreeben, R. (1970). The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman.

Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Eddy, E. (1969). Becoming a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edgar, D., & Warren, R. (1969). Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 42, 386-399.

Edwards, R. (1979). Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books.

Egan, K. (1982, March). The power of personal context in making students teachers: Three cases. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Etzioni, A. (1965). Organizational control structure. In J. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (in press). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), The third handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Fenstermacher, G. (1980). What needs to be known about what teachers need to know? In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Boles, K. (1983). Teaching: An imperiled profession. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Gaede, O. (1978). Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. Clearinghouse, 51, 405-409.

Gibson, R. (1976). The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 2, 241-250.

Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 162, 5-27.

Gitlin, A. (1983). School structure and teachers' work. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Goodlad, J. (1982). Let's get on with the reconstruction. Kappan, 63, 19-20.

Haller, E. (1967). Pupils' influences in teacher socialization: A socio-linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 40, 316-333.

Hammersley, M. (1977). Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press.

Hanson, D., & Herrington, M. (1976). From college to classroom: The probationary year. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Harris, K. (1982). Teachers and classes: A Marxist analysis. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hook, C., & Rosenshine, B. (1979). Accuracy of teacher reports of their classroom behavior. Review of Educational Research, 49, 1-12.

Hoy, W. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 66, 89-93.

Johnston, J., & Ryan, K. (1983). Research on the beginning teacher. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York: Longman.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Larkin, R. (1973). Contextual influences on teacher leadership styles. Sociology of Education, 46, 471-479.

Ligana, J. (1970). What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers? Danville, Illinois: Institute Printers.

Lortie, D. (1966). Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

Lortie, D. (1973). Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mardle, G., & Walker, M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm.

McArthur, J. (1978). What does teaching do to teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 89-103.

McDonald, F. (1980). The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. Study of induction programs for beginning teachers (Volume 1). Princeton, New Jersey: ETS.

Metz, M. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In M. Meyer (Ed.), Environments and organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newberry, J. (1977, April). The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York. ERIC Document No. ED 137 299.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. (1980). Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 6, 51-61.

Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 3, 19-37.

Power, P. (1981). Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 25, 288-296.

Rosow, I. (1965). Forms and functions of adult socialization. Social Forces, 44, 35-45.

Ryan, K. (1970). Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schlechty, P. (1976). Teaching and social behavior: Toward an organizational theory of instruction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schwille, J. et al. (1979). Factors influencing teachers' decisions about what to teach. (Research Series No. 62) East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Sprinthall, N., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner. In G. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development. The eighty-second yearbook of NSSE, (Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephens, J. (1967). The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., Egan, K. (1982, March). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Tisher, R. (1982, March). Teacher induction: An international perspective on research and programs. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Wise, A. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 26, 183-193.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), The first years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin, Texas: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 7-11.

Appendix A

SUMMARIES OF THE FOUR CASE STUDIES

For three of the four teachers--Beth, Rachel, Sarah--perspectives toward teaching seemed to come into focus by the end of the student teaching semester. Each had a perspective in which a teacher was to exercise considerable control over the style and content of instruction in order to offer pupils an experience of active learning, in which pupils tested and used their own experience to give deeper meanings to concepts. Beth was the most tentative of the three in holding to such a perspective, but she joined the others in expecting a teacher to interact in a warm and humane way with students. Rachel seemed to have the most difficulty in being close to children, though she stated her belief in the value of this kind of teacher-pupil relationship. Beth differed from the others in being less accepting of pupils as individuals, expecting groups of children to exhibit actions characteristic of some group to which they belonged (e.g., coming from low income homes).

Hannah's perspective toward teaching was more problematic at the end of her student teaching semester. She stated beliefs that would suggest similar perspectives toward teaching to those of Rachel and Sarah. These statements were definite and unequivocal. The powerful institutional constraints of her school during student teaching and her response of strategic compliance made it unclear whether she would do what she said she wanted to once she was "teacher" rather than "student teacher."

Although there was individual variation, the four teachers were relatively alike in their apparent perspectives toward teaching when

they took up their first teaching positions. They went into quite different school settings, but the four schools were alike in certain general ways. Within each school there was a collection of related institutional elements that projected a formal school culture. These included: explicit school regulations (e.g., teachers must stay at school until 4:00 p.m.; pupils are not to be in classrooms unless supervised by a teacher); official time tables (e.g., a specific time when pupils change classes for reading; time when last school bus leaves); curriculum guides and curriculum materials (Performance Based Objectives, textbooks, elaborately complete worksheets or a ban on using worksheets); formal status relations of principal, specialist teachers, teachers, and pupils.

At the same time, each school was characterized by an informal school culture, one that was often tacit rather than explicit. Even when explicit, the informal culture was less visible than the formal culture, being expressed in private conversations between teachers, casual remarks not intended for wide distribution, interpretations of the publicly acknowledged formal culture expressed in teacher, principal, pupil actions. There was usually one formal school culture, but there were several different and often conflicting versions of the informal school culture within a single school.

Three of the four teachers--Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah--maintained the perspectives toward teaching which they brought with them to their first year of teaching. Sarah and Hannah used the experience of the first year to strengthen and refine their perspectives. Rachel's was maintained even though she had few instances of successful teaching to sustain her.

For Sarah, extending her perspective was not a struggle. Both the formal and informal school cultures encouraged her to continue to express her perspective, although in a restrained and cautious form. The most constraining element of the formal culture in her school was the control exerted by daily time schedules, the rush to "cover" all the material scheduled for the year, the requirement that she stay with her pupils as long as they were in school. The curriculum itself demanded attention to predetermined topics, but left considerable opportunity for Sarah to emphasize some topics more than others. The informal school culture acted as a countervailing force to the formal culture in her school. Her colleagues in the other fourth-grade classrooms used the freedom they had to express unique teaching styles, to introduce interesting and varied activities in order to keep pupil interest and effort high. Other teachers in the school casually praised Sarah's evident success (as guessed from student essays and murals displayed in the hall) in eliciting thoughtful and creative products from her pupils. Despite being worn out at the end of the day, Sarah picked up the underlying enjoyment of teaching and of being able to circumvent unwanted constraints, that was part of the informal culture of her school.

Rachel and Hannah encountered considerable pressure to change to a perspective that was impersonal, permitting pupils almost no deviation from teacher-set requirements and encouraging little pupil initiative or creativity in building concepts or in analyzing generalizations about the social or natural world.

Rachel was alone in her school in challenging this perspective. There was some constraint imposed by the formal school culture as the

principal monitored the noise and movement levels in her classroom (the standard was to have little of either). Neither the curriculum nor other formal school regulations were very constraining. Unfortunately, Rachel was unable to keep her pupils quiet or focused for very long at a time. She found her efforts to encourage pupil initiative rejected or abused by students who had been socialized to expect teacher demands and close control in a social context in which adults and children were natural enemies. This was part of the ethos of the informal teacher culture as well. From her colleagues Rachel had the scant consolation that previous teachers too had found her class difficult to manage. Rachel did not have the skill to overcome the pupils' long period of induction into patterns of response other than the self-motivated learning she hoped to encourage. Her doubts about asserting her authority and her inclination to avoid too close relationships with her pupils made it difficult for her to get their attention. Her interest in mobilizing parent support and cooperation was thwarted by lack of knowledge of the cultural content of her pupils' homes and her inability to talk to people who did not feel confident speaking English. Her fear of her principal's disapproval led her to early attempts to act the authoritarian teacher that she believed her principal wanted her to be be. Her inability to get her pupils to behave when she tried to be strict and demanding helped her to reaffirm her earlier perspective. Despite her lack of support from colleagues, the rejecting and often disruptive responses of her pupils, and her own feelings of despair, Rachel was sustained by a few successes and continued to act as she thought a teacher should, trying again and again to justify her faith that if she could make the work interesting enough, involve students in

active learning, they would be intrinsically motivated to learn and even become better behaved.

The pressure for Hannah to change her perspective was more subtle but no less pervasive. There was almost no direct supervision of her work by her principal since he was responsible for teaching one of the grades on a regular, full-time basis. Minimal control came through other elements of the formal culture; curriculum guides, for example, were not even available to her until near the end of the school year. The pressure was largely of an informal kind. Teachers shook their heads in disapproval of her warm and close personal interaction with her pupils. They warned "it won't work" to trust eighth graders to monitor their own behavior, make decisions about where and with whom to work in the classroom, to let pupils see the teacher as a person as well as a professional or, conversely, to try to learn too much about the non-school lives of children and their families. Hannah chose to try to know the community and her pupils' parents in order to understand her pupils better, in order to help her convince parents that her "different" school program was justifiable. At the same time, she chose to exploit the openings in the weakly formed net of teaching constraints in order to develop and implement a more varied program that relied more on pupil participation and pupil judgment than was typical of the school. Although her pupils, like Rachel's, had had seven years of training in a different system of curriculum and of teacher-pupil relations, Hannah's social and political skill, the pupils' traditions of mutual peer support, and their warm acceptance of Hannah as "teacher-friend" overcame any pupil resistance to learning new ways to be pupils in school. In addition, there were obvious rewards to pupils in having the school

day become more enjoyable, less ego destructive, more productive of interesting things to do.

In contrast to the other three teachers in our study, Beth appeared to shift away from her earlier perspective during her first year of teaching toward one that was more bureaucratic in terms of teacher role and more impersonal and controlling in terms of teacher-pupil relationships. This was consistent with a schoolwide emphasis upon teaching knowledge as certain, through a curriculum organized to stress the transmission of information and routine skills of language and math rather than the examination of issues or the exploration of ambiguities. Such a curriculum helped control pupil behavior by narrowing the range of acceptable pupil response. It can support a view of student diversity in which all pupils are expected to achieve the same results although very likely at different rates. Beth had little patience with pupil behavior or ideas that challenged or were different from the official view.

This shift in perspective was encouraged by the direct control of the principal, who wandered through the school looking and listening for signs of nonconformity to the officially approved curriculum patterns and the maintenance of quiet, busy looking students. He was reinforced by the bureaucratic organization of the school into teaching teams. Although there was no intermediate level of administration (e.g., teachers who were "team leaders"), the teachers monitored one another since deviation from the agreed-upon schedule or distribution of pupils affected the other members in the team. Supervision of teacher behavior was facilitated by the open architectural plan of the school which made large areas of the school visible from any one vantage point. The

"leakage" of sound and the potentially disturbing effects this could have on other pupils and teachers was a strong incentive to enforcing strict compliance to rules of quiet work in order to avoid annoying one's colleagues. The curriculum pattern itself, and the close interdependent timing of pupil tasks, extended another form of control, constraining teachers to move on to the next task whenever minimal achievement goals had been met and discouraging teacher or pupil initiatives that took "too long" (longer than planned) or aimed toward side roads of knowledge not part of the preplanned (and post-tested) curriculum.

Notes

[1]The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the United States National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. The authors wish to recognize the important role played by Kathleen Densmore and Glenn Hudak in helping us gather the data which this study reports. In addition, we are indebted to Ms. Densmore for her critical reading of the first draft of this manuscript.

[2]Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) outline three different "scenarios" found in the literature for how the schools and universities influence teacher development. Also see Feiman-Nemser (1983) and Zeichner (1983) for a review of alternative explanations of beginning teacher socialization.

[3]Also, very few researchers in either group have conducted analyses of observed teaching. With few exceptions, these studies have relied exclusively on teacher self-reports of behavior or on attitude surveys for their data. See Zeichner and Grant (1981) and Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982) for discussions of the limitations of pre-post survey research in attempting to understand the processes of teacher socialization. Also, see Hook and Rosenshine (1979) for a discussion of the problematic aspects of relying on teacher self-reports of their behavior.

[4]More detailed information about this portion of the study, including the selection of the sample and data collection methods is presented in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982).

[5]See Berlak and Berlak (1981) for a discussion of the concept of "dilemmas" of teaching.

[6]These case studies are presented in full in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982). Summaries of the four case studies are included in Appendix A of the present paper.

[7]Two of these three students selected their placements for reasons other than compatibility with their preferred teaching styles. Hannah chose her placement because it was one of the few paid placements available in the program and the other student chose her bilingual placement because the "maintenance-oriented" and self-contained program she desired was not available. In the case of a final student, the conflicts which resulted from the very different perspectives of her cooperating teacher and university supervisor reduced the significance of her role in selecting a placement and prevented her from asserting her own preferred perspective.

[8]See Appendix A for summaries of the four case studies.

[9]In terms of survival, two of the teachers (Hannah and Beth) were rehired and taught in the same schools at the same grade levels the following year. Rachel was offered a contract for the following year,

but did not accept it. Sarah was laid off because of a decline in pupil enrollment and taught the following year in another school district.

[10]Etzioni (1965, p. 655) also points out that there are significant differences in the degree to which organizational control structures are needed in organizations because of differences in the degree of selection and socialization. For example, "if the organization could recruit individuals who would perform as required automatically or could educate its participants so they would perform adequately without supervision, there would be no need for a structure of control." Although the present paper considers the perspectives of the four teachers in relation to the institutional bias in each school, it does not provide an analysis of the processes by which the four teachers were selected for their positions.

[11]Pollard (1982, p. 26), drawing upon the seminal work of Bachrach and Baratz (1962) on political decision making, define "institutional bias" as a working consensus at a school level that is actively produced by negotiation among school staff each with particular interests. This "institutional bias" represents a stability of understandings and reflects power differentials among staff. Pollard (1982, p. 27) goes on to state that particular forms of teacher culture will develop within the context of the institutional bias and that teacher culture is but one contributing element of the institutional bias which also derives inputs from the children, parents, material and legal constraint, the LEA advisers, etc.

Table 1

EIGHTEEN DILEMMAS OF TEACHING*

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Public knowledge--Personal knowledge
2. Knowledge is product--Knowledge is process
3. Knowledge is certain--Knowledge is problematic
4. Learning is fragmented--Learning is holistic
5. Learning is unrelated--Learning is integrated
6. Learning is a collective activity--Learning is an individual activity
7. Teacher control over pupil learning: high--low

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant-Personal teacher-pupil relationships
9. Teacher control over pupil behavior: high--low

The Teacher's Role

10. The teacher's role in determining what to teach: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent
11. The teacher's role in deciding how to teach: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent
12. The teacher's role in relation to school rules and regulations: Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

Student Diversity

13. Children as unique--Children as members of a category
14. School curriculum: Universalism--Particularism
15. Student behavior: Universalism--Particularism
16. Allocation of school resources: Equal--Differential
17. Common culture--Subgroup consciousness emphasis in school curriculum
18. Career orientation in relation to student diversity: Little restriction--Restricted

---

* The complete operational definitions for each of the 18 dilemmas are presented in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982). Wherever possible we used labels similar to those used by Berlak and Berlak (1981) in order to minimize the number of new labels and terms.

Table 2

THE FOUR TEACHERS: STUDENT TEACHING AND THE FIRST YEAR

	Student Teaching	The First Year
Hannah	4th-5th grade Total departmentalization within teams Suburban	8th grade Self-contained/minimal departmentalization Rural Only teacher at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Rachel	4th-5th grade Self-contained class Urban	7th grade Self-contained/minimal departmentalization Urban Only teacher at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Beth	5th grade Self-contained class Urban	8th grade Heavy departmentalization within teams Suburban One of nine teachers at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Sarah	Junior primary (pre first grade) Self-contained class Suburban	4th grade Self-contained/minimal departmentalization Suburban One of 3 teachers at her grade level One of three first-year teachers in her school

Table 3

EIGHT POSSIBLE SOCIAL STRATEGIES

	Similar School Context	Dissimilar School Context
Internalized adjustment	X	X
Strategic compliance	X	X
Successful strategic redefinition	X	X
Unsuccessful strategic redefinition	X	X

Table 4

THE DOMINANT SOCIAL STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY THE FOUR TEACHERS DURING STUDENT TEACHING AND THE FIRST YEAR

	Student Teachers	The First Year
Hannah	Strategic compliance	Successful strategic redefinition (dissimilar context)
Rachel	Internalized adjustment	Unsuccessful strategic redefinition (dissimilar context)
Beth	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment (dissimilar context)
Sarah	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment (similar context)

SECTION IV

Phase III: Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Studying the Development of Teacher Perspectives

INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL INFLUENCES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin-Madison

May, 1984

The research reported herein was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL INFLUENCES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

Lortie (1973, p. 488) concludes, in his examination of "the riddle of teacher socialization," that there are several credible explanations of the socialization process available and that the socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a simple, one-factor frame of reference." When one examines the empirical literature on teacher socialization, including that work which has been completed since 1973, Lortie's analysis is strongly confirmed. There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature with regard to the potency and influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms that affect the development of teacher perspectives over a career.

Amid this debate over the relative contribution of specific people and contextual factors to the socialization of teachers, there is also disagreement over the degree to which the development of occupational perspectives by teachers is influenced by individual or institutional factors. On the one hand, some have argued that individual teacher characteristics, dispositions, and capabilities are more influential in determining the course of teacher socialization than are the various institutional characteristics associated with teacher education and schooling. Other studies have emphasized the potency of institutional influences and have ignored the role of individual and biographical factors. A third position, exemplified by the work of Lacey (1977) and Pollard (1982) in England and by Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press) and Zeichner and Tabachnick (in press) in the United States, has considered the <u>interaction</u> of individual and institutional factors and has

emphasized the role of both individual intent and institutional constraint in the development of teacher perspectives.

In addition to the lack of consensus over the most potent socializing agents and mechanisms and the existence of different points of view regarding the relative contribution of individual and institutional influences, there is also much disagreement about the degree of stability or change in the perspectives of individual teachers throughout their formal training and careers. When are teaching perspectives first formed and how do they change and develop (if at all) during formal training and inservice school experience? Here some studies have documented a great deal of discontinuity between anticipatory socialization, formal training, and inservice school experience, and have shown dramatic changes in the perspectives of teachers at different points in time. Studies also exist which demonstrate a great deal of stability in perspectives across time.

Finally, there is also much disagreement about the nature of teaching perspectives themselves both at an individual and occupational level. These differences are concerned with the degree of internal consistency in the perspectives of individual teachers and with the degree of homogeneity in perspectives in the occupation as a whole. Some studies have emphasized the internally consistent nature of individual teachers' perspectives and the uniformity of perspectives in the occupation as a whole. Other studies have emphasized the contradictions embedded in the perspectives of individual teachers and the heterogeneous "teacher cultures" existent in various "segments" of the occupational group.

This chapter will review the empirical evidence which currently exists with regard to each of these issues of controversy: (1) the nature of teacher perspectives; (2) the influence of specific socializing agents and mechanisms on the development of teacher perspectives; (3) the relative contribution of individual intent and institutional constraint to the development of teacher perspectives; and (4) the degree of stability in individual teachers' perspectives from the advent of formal training through the early years of a teacher's career. Because most of the extant research has focused on the socialization of student teachers or beginning teachers, this chapter will not consider the development of teacher perspectives beyond the initial transition to teaching.

Following an analysis of different points of view on the nature of individual and occupational perspectives themselves, consideration will be given to alternative explanations regarding the development of teacher perspectives: (1) prior to formal training; (2) during preservice teacher education; and (3) during the early years of school experience. In doing so, the issue of stability or change in perspectives across these three points in time will also be addressed. Pollard's (1982) conceptual model, describing three layers of social contextualization (interactive, institutional, and cultural) will be employed as a heuristic device for analyzing the individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives subsequent to formal training. Finally, following this analysis of the influence of specific socializing agents and mechanisms and the stability or change in perspectives across time, the relative contribution of individual intent and institutional constraint will be considered. Empirical evidence

will be reviewed related to contrasting points of view on this issue, and an argument will be offered in support of an interactive model of teacher socialization. Throughout the analysis, an attempt will be made to identify the strength of the empirical evidence supporting particular points of view and to suggest areas where there is a particular need for further empirical work to be initiated.

The Nature of Teacher Perspectives

Becker et al. (1961, p. 34), in their study of the socialization of medical students, define perspectives as "a coordinated series of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation. According to this view, perspectives differ from attitudes since they involve actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, perspectives are defined in relation to specific problematic situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies (see Sharp & Green, 1975). This construct of perspectives has been widely utilized in studies of teacher socialization.[1]

Although the classification of individual teachers' perspectives into dichotomous categories such as "progressive/traditional," "formal/informal," "custodial/humanistic," has been criticized for many years (see Anderson, 1959; Travers, 1971) as overly reductionist, this practice still dominates the literature on teacher socialization. According to this view, the various dimensions of individual teachers' perspectives are internally consistent and the categories themselves (e.g., "progressive/traditional") are mutually exclusive. Along with this practice, it has been commonly assumed that most teachers share a

uniform teaching culture and that the degree of diversity in teaching perspectives in the occupation as a whole is very small.

Several criticisms have been raised in the literature regarding the validity of both of these views. First, Hammersley, (1977a) urges researchers to be cautious of assuming that there is necessarily a logical consistency between the various components of individual teachers' perspectives and that there are no similarities among teachers who hold different perspectives on some dimensions.

> The diversity of teaching forms is of course rather more complex than is represented in such dichotomies. Furthermore, existing typologies often both overlap and conflict with one another as well as compounding what on analyses turn out to be distinct dimensions. The assumptions which are seen as going together often do so neither logically nor empirically. (Hammersley, 1977a, p. 15)

There is recent evidence from several empirical studies (e.g., Barr & Duffy, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975; Bussis et al., 1976; Berlak & Berlak, 1981; Tabachnick & Zeichner, in press) that bipolar unidimensional characterizations of perspectives have greatly oversimplified differences within and among teachers. First, with regard to the mutual exclusivity of categories of perspectives and the assumption of homogeneity within categories, Berlak and Berlak (1981, p. 199) conclude:

> Despite their ambiguities, the labels formal/informal as commonly used in the schools we visited, do in some general way distinguish two types of teachers. . . . However, it is only in dealing with the extremes that this division does not present insurmountable problems. . . . There is clearly a wide range of patterns that teachers and kids commonly associated with informal, and a range they associated with formal.

Similarly, Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press) have documented significant overlap between and significant variance within the categories of "progressive" and "traditional" in their study of the

development of teaching perspectives during student teaching. Finally, Gray and Satterly (1981) go a step further and question the use of tripartite classifications when they conclude that the differences between teachers within "styles" (in Bennett's, 1976, study) were far greater than the differences between the "styles" themselves.

The typical assumption of internal consistency among the various dimensions of individual teachers' perspectives has also been challenged by recent research. For example, the studies of Barr and Duffy (1978), Berlak and Berlak (1981), and Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press) have all documented (with regard to the perspectives of specific teachers) that individual dimensions of perspectives do not always fit researchers' conceptions of what goes logically together and that the individual dimensions themselves frequently change as teachers are faced with changing circumstances.

Berlak and Berlak (1981) argue that it is not surprising to find these contradictions and inconsistencies within the perspectives of individual teachers since contradictions are embedded in the society and institutions in which teachers work.

> Teachers take on or assume some of the social attitudes, values, and beliefs of the multiple groups or communities to which they belong or with whom they come into contact over the course of their lifetimes. . . . The diversity of these various experiences and ideas within the "generalized other" often results in multiple and conflicting beliefs about evaluations of most schooling acts, within as well as among teachers. (Berlak & Berlak, p. 100)

It has also been conventional to assume a high degree of homogeneity in perspectives in the occupation as a whole. According to this view, teachers are socialized into a uniform "teacher culture." Feiman-Nemser and Floden (in press) conclude that this assumption of cultural uniformity in the occupation is untenable.

> Teachers differ in age, experience, social and cultural background, gender, marital status, subject matter, wisdom, and ability. The schools in which they work also differ in many ways, as do the groups of students they teach. All these differences may lead to differences in teaching culture. (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, in press, p. 8)

This conclusion is supported by several empirical studies where diverse teaching cultures were discovered even within single schools (e.g., Gracey, 1972; Metz, 1978; Carew & Lightfoot, 1979). This existence of diverse teaching cultures has important implications for the study of the development of teacher perspectives, for once one accepts this view it logically follows that teachers are faced with conflicting pressures to act in different ways and the interaction of a particular set of norms becomes problematic. Berlak and Berlak's (1981) notion of "dilemmas" attempts to capture these contradictions and inconsistencies at both the institutional and individual level. Whatever conclusions one reaches with regard to the developmental issues to be discussed below, the nature of perspectives themselves, the dynamic "product" of this developmental process, need to be viewed in more complex and subtle ways than has typically been the case.

Pretraining Influences

> Teachers teach as they were taught during their many years as students. Their professional preparation comes late in their own schooling and is too little and too thin to separate them from what their experience has taught them that teaching is. Their professional preparation and subsequent practice merely reinforce their own perceptions. Teachers fail to transcend the conventional wisdom of their own profession and continue to teach as they were taught. (Goodlad, 1982, p. 19-20)

There are many like Goodlad who argue that experiences predating formal training are more profoundly influential in the making of a teacher than the efficacy of either preservice training or socialization

in the workplace during a career. The apparent persistence of particular forms of pedagogy (see Sirotnik, 1983) is explained by the failure of reform initiatives and the overt curriculum of teacher education to overcome the effects of this anticipatory socialization. Feiman-Nemser (1983) summarizes the arguments related to the three most prevalent explanations of the influence of pretraining experiences on the development of teacher perspectives. First, Stephens (1967) proposes an "evolutionary" theory to account for the development of teacher perspectives and emphasizes the role of "spontaneous pedagogical tendencies" in explaining why teachers act as they do. According to this view:

> Human beings have survived because of their deeply ingrained habits of correcting one another, telling each other what they know, pointing out the moral, and supplying the answer. These tendencies have been acquired over the centuries and are lived out in families and classrooms. Thus children not only learn what they are told by parents and teachers, they also learn to be teachers. (Feiman-Nemser, 1983, p. 152)

A second position outlined by Feiman-Nemser (1983) is the "psychoanalytic" explanation found in the work of Wright (1959) and Wright and Tuska (1967, 1968). These studies suggest that teacher perspectives are affected to a considerable extent by the quality of relationships as a child with important adults (e.g., mother, father, teachers) and that becoming a teacher is to some extent a process (sometimes unconscious and sometimes deliberate) of trying to become like the significant others in one's childhood. According to this view, early relationships with significant others are the prototypes of subsequent relationships throughout life and the kinds of teachers that education students become are governed by the effects this childhood heritage has on their personalities (Wright & Tuska, 1967). These studies offer empirical

data in support of this "Childhood Romance Theory of Teacher Development" including several statements written by teachers which illustrate the significance of a conscious identification with a teacher during childhood (see Wright, 1959). According to this view, the "reality shock" which is apparently experienced by many beginning teachers is explained by the failure of training to overcome these early fantasies about teaching and teachers (Wright & Tuska, 1968).

A third viewpoint on the role of pretraining experience on the development of teacher perspectives emphasizes the influence of the thousands of hours spent as a pupil in what Lortie (1975) refers to as an "apprenticeship of observation." According to this view, teacher socialization occurs largely through the internalization of teaching models during the time spent as a pupil in close contact with teachers. According to Lortie (1975), the activation of this latent culture during formal training and later school experience is a major influence in shaping teachers' conceptions of the teaching role and role performance. Formal training at the university is viewed as having little impact in altering the cumulative effects of this anticipatory socialization. Lortie (1975, p. 85) even questions the use of the term socialization to describe entry into the teaching role:

> The connotations of the term socialization seem somewhat askew when applied to this kind of induction, since they imply greater receptivity to a preexisting culture than seems to prevail. Teachers are largely self-made. The internalization of common knowledge plays only a limited part in their movement to work responsibility.

Lortie's argument is based, in part, on several studies where teachers attested to the tangential role of their formal training and where they frequently referred to the continuing influence of their earlier mentors (see Lortie, 1975). Generally, however, there is little

empirical evidence which directly supports Lortie's position or the other two points of view. Most of the empirical evidence in support of the influence of pretraining experiences on the development of teacher perspectives is indirect in nature and demonstrates a continuity in perspectives during formal training without supporting a particular theoretical explanation. Studies conducted by Petty and Hogben (1980) and Hogben and Lawson (1983) in Australia, by Maddox (1968) and Mardle and Walker (1980) in England, and by Zeichner and Grant (1981) and Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press) in the United States clearly indicate that biography exerts a powerful influence on the development of teacher perspectives, but much work remains to be done to clarify the particular nature of this influence.

The Impact of Preservice Teacher Education

Feiman-Nemser (1983) argues that it is impossible to understand the impact of the preservice preparation of teachers on teacher development without knowing more about what this preparation is like. Sarason et al.'s (1962) characterization of preservice preparation as "an unstudied problem" remains as true today as it was twenty years ago despite the literally hundreds of studies which have been conducted on the impact of education courses and field experiences on teacher development. Generally these studies have not provided much information about the substance of preservice preparation beyond descriptions of course titles and credit distributions (see Zeichner, in press), and they have provided even less information about how the knowledge and skills communicated to prospective teachers during training are received

and then incorporated into the perspectives of teachers (e.g., see Zeichner, 1984; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, in press).

There are two major elements in the professional education component of a preservice preparation program: (1) the educational methods and foundations courses; (2) the field experiences which are typically carried out in K-12 classrooms. First, with regard to the influence of the formal knowledge distributed in education courses on the development of teacher perspectives, there is much evidence that pedagogical methods and content knowledge introduced to students in campus courses has little influence on the subsequent actions of students in classrooms even during initial training (e.g., Hodges, 1982; Grant, 1981; Katz & Raths, 1982). There is also evidence that when attempts are made to systematically train prospective teachers in the performance of specific teaching skills through the use of procedures such as microteaching, that the continued use of the skill by prospective teachers outside of the laboratory is highly dependent on whether the ecological conditions in classrooms are conducive to the use of the skills. Copeland's (1980) work suggests that the impact of formal courses in education cannot be assessed apart from consideration of these ecological conditions.

These and similar studies are all concerned in one way or another with the impact of the overt curriculum of initial preparation on the development of teacher perspectives. Dale (1977 a, b) and Bartholomew (1976) argue, on the other hand, that the chief impact of initial preparation comes not through the formal knowledge and skills imparted to teachers, but through the <u>hidden curriculum</u> of teacher preparation programs. For example, Dale (1977 a, b) conducted a content analysis of typical English courses in the philosophical, sociological, and psycho-

logical foundations of education and concluded that initial training fosters a cognitive style of "liberal individualism" which predisposes prospective teachers to see the world in particular ways, to become conscious of it having particular properties and possibilities and to reject or never recognize other properties and possibilities. Dale (1977a, p. 51) specifically argues that this cognitive style:

> directs teachers to seek the source of pupils' problems and the solution of these problems in the individuals concerned as well as providing a context for them to see their own failures and satisfactions as individual matters.

On the other hand, according to Dale, this cognitive style does not lead teachers to question the nature and the values of the system in which they practice or to seek the solutions to problems confronting them in social relations and institutions rather than in individuals. Haberman (1981) has offered an analysis of the hegemony of "the psychological way of knowing" in United States teacher education which essentially supports Dale's thesis.

Bartholomew (1976) analyzes other aspects of the hidden curriculum of preservice preparation (the pedagogical practices and social relations and social organization of programs) and concludes that despite the fact that teacher education programs encourage students to use liberal phrases and to affirm liberal slogans in places other than the university, the facts of socialization <u>within</u> the university (e.g., the separation of theory and practice) encourage the development of "objectionist" conceptions of knowledge, fragmented views of curriculum, and a view of learners as passive recipients of officially approved knowledge. According to Bartholomew (1976) and others such as Giroux (1980), Ginsburg (1984), and Popkewitz (in press), the real impact of preservice preparation lies in these images of teacher, learner,

knowledge, curriculum, and professional which are subtly communicated to prospective teachers through the covert processes of the hidden curriculum of teacher education programs. Thus, despite the overwhelming evidence related to the low impact of the formal curriculum of teacher education, one must be cautious in generalizing these findings to the impact of the preservice experiences as a whole. Generally arguments related to the impact of the hidden curriculum in preservice preparation have been offered on logical and theoretical grounds with very little substantiating empirical evidence. With the exception of Ginsburg's (1984) study of the development of perspectives toward professionalism, we do not have very strong empirical evidence which confirms that students actually incorporate elements into their perspectives in ways consistent with the theoretical arguments.

The second aspect of preservice preparation which has received much attention in the literature in relation to the development of teacher perspectives is the field experience component. Here those who have analyzed the empirical literature have consistently characterized the knowledge base related to the socializing impact of these experiences as weak and ambiguous (e.g., Zeichner, 1980, 1984; McIntyre, 1983; Griffin et al, 1983). Today, despite the existence of numerous individual studies which have demonstrated specific effects of field experiences on the development of individual teachers under particular conditions, there continues to be a great deal of debate about the role these experiences play in the development of teacher perspectives and about the relative contribution of various people and factors within these experiences to the socialization process. Zeichner (1980), for example, describes two "myths" related to the impact of these experiences which

have survived despite the existence of hundreds of individual studies. Generally, studies related to the role of field experiences in the development of teacher perspectives have not attended to the quality or substance of these experiences and have not identified the particular kinds of field programs and components within programs (e.g., characteristics of placement sites) which are related to the development of particular kinds of perspectives by individual students who differ from each other. Field experiences seem to have different effects upon the development of perspectives depending upon the nature of a program and the characters and dispositions of individual students, but we currently know very little about these effects beyond the conflicting scenarios which have been constructed from analyses of central tendencies.

In summary, the question of impact of preservice preparation on the development of teacher perspectives has several dimensions. Studies of the influence of the formal curriculum of programs suggest that preservice programs are not very powerful interventions. On the other hand, studies of the influence of the hidden curriculum of programs suggest without much documentation, that the impact of preservice training may be far greater than has often been thought. Finally, studies of field experiences indicate that these experiences have differential effects on teacher development but do not illuminate the particular characteristics of programs or individuals which are related to specific effects. This whole area is clearly one where a great deal of empirical work remains to be done.

The Impact of School Experience

> The practical activity of teachers does not exist in a vacuum. The strategies employed by teachers arise in the context of a school organization which provides the prevailing circumstances taken into account by teachers in their routine activity. The school organization provides dilemmas and imperatives, possibilities and opportunities, and it is these which explain the existence of particular strategies in the classroom. (Denscombe, 1980, p. 290)

Pollard (1982) has developed a conceptual model describing three layers of social contextualization which is heuristic in understanding the influence of the workplace of the school on the development of teacher perspectives. According to Pollard, teacher perspectives (or "coping strategies") represent active and creative responses by teachers to the constraints, opportunities, and dilemmas posed by the immediate contexts of the classroom and school, and it is through these immediate determinants of teacher perspectives that the wider structure of society, the state and mode of production have their impact.

At the <u>interactive</u> level within the classroom, Pollard (1982) describes several different kinds of influence on the pragmatic perspectives of teachers. Two of these influences: (1) the socializing role of pupils, and (2) the influence of the ecology of the classroom will be considered here. Lortie (1975) argues that the psychic rewards of teaching come largely from pupils. Jackson (1968) suggests that teachers most often look to their pupils for validation of their efforts rather than to colleagues or administrators. There is substantial evidence that pupils' responses reinforce the teachers' behaviors which evoke them and that pupils play an important role in influencing teacher perspectives (Hammersley, 1977 b).

This position on the significant role of pupils in occupational socialization is supported both on logical grounds and by empirical research. Haller (1967) and Doyle (1979) argue that the important role of pupils in teacher socialization is understandable given the typical isolation of teachers from their colleagues and supervisors and given the transitory and invisible nature of the learning process.

> This invisibility of the learning process has important consequences for the teacher, for it means that there is no single objective and immediate method by which he can unequivocally assess his performance. Instead, most teachers rely on observations of their students, oftentimes watching for highly transitory reactions in pupil behavior which they believe indicates that learning has occurred. (Haller, 1967, p. 318)

These and other "logical" explanations of the importance of pupils in the occupational socialization of teachers are consistent with bidirectional models of childhood socialization (e.g., Dreitzel, 1973) and are supported by a substantial number of empirical studies on classroom influence (e.g., Fiedler, 1975; Noble & Nolan, 1976; Brophy & Evertson, 1981). According to Doyle (1979, p. 139), "The influence of students ranges from the general teaching methods and patterns of language that teachers use in classrooms to the type and frequency of teacher questions and feedback given to individual students." Furthermore, the individual characteristics of both teachers and students seem to affect the ways in which pupils influence teacher perspectives. For example, according to Doyle (1979, p. 139), "Research has shown that high achieving students appear to have the greatest amount of influence on teachers, especially when the teacher is high in measures of cognitive complexity."

As a result of these studies, there is little question that classroom influence is reciprocal in nature and that teachers' perceptions of

pupils' characteristics, expectations, and behaviors influence the development of teacher perspectives. The Wisconsin studies of teacher socialization (Zeichner & Tabachnick, in press) reinforce this conclusion and document the powerful role of pupil responses in influencing the teaching perspectives of beginning teachers. Despite this general knowledge, we currently have very little understanding of how the specific characteristics of teachers and pupils mediate the development of particular kinds of perspectives.

Doyle (1979), after demonstrating through a review of research that pupils are significant socializing agents, goes on to argue that student effects are just one facet of the larger question of the effects of classrooms on teachers. Doyle (1977, 1979), Copeland (1980), and others have emphasized the role of the ecology of the classroom in shaping teachers' perspectives. Doyle and Ponder (1975, p. 183) define the ecological system of the classroom as "that network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment." Doyle (1977) has identified five distinctive features of classrooms that he claims are crucial in shaping the work of teachers: multidimensionality, simultaneity, immediacy, unpredictability, and history. Others such as Dreeben (1973), Westbury (1973), Sharp & Green (1975), Dale (1977 a, b), and Denscombe (1980, 1982) all discuss various factors related to the material conditions and the social organization of the classroom and how they affect teachers' perspectives. Among these are teacher-pupil ratios, limited material resources, and time. According to Doyle (1979, p. 139):

> Classrooms are crowded with people, activity and interruptions; many events take place at the same time, and there is little time for the teacher to reflect before acting or even to anticipate the course of events. In addition classroom

> groups meet regularly over an extended period of time so that rules that evolve for the behavior of teachers and students and decisions at one point have consequences for action in the future. . . . If teachers met their students one at a time and at the students' initiative, the setting for teaching would contain few of these elements.

According to this view of classrooms as ecological environments, learning to teach involves "learning the texture of the classroom and the sets of behaviors congruent with the environmental demands of that setting" (Doyle, 1977; p. 51). It is felt that the environmental demands posed by current classroom arrangements establish limits on the range of teacher behaviors that can be successful in particular settings and that "successful" teachers must learn a set of coping strategies which are appropriate to particular settings. These ecological classroom conditions, however, not only act as constraints on the actions of teachers, but they also exert positive pressures to act in certain ways. According to Hammersley (1977 b, p. 7), these social forces "both constrain and facilitate action . . . . The social context and its interpretation by individual teachers make certain actions possible and block or make difficult other lines of action in which a different setting might be possible." Although there seems to be little doubt at present that the characteristics of the classroom as a workplace need to be closely examined in any attempt to understand the development of teacher perspectives, the analysis cannot remain at the level of the classroom alone because these ecological conditions are themselves products of policy decisions and political actions at levels beyond the classroom.

At the <u>institutional</u> level of analysis (Pollard, 1982), socializing influences related to the characteristics of schools as workplaces come into focus. Fenstermacher (1980) has argued that teachers' experiences

with the institutional characteristics of schools are the most potent determinants of their perspectives toward teaching. In a similar vein, Dreeben (1970, 1973) has written extensively about how certain organizational perspectives of schools have implications for the character of teachers' work. Dreeben's thesis is that certain structural properties of schools such as their internal spatial arrangement (e.g., egg crate vs. open plan); modes of affiliation (e.g., hired vs. conscripted); and authority relations (e.g., between teachers and administrators) shape the character of teachers' work activities and that teacher perspectives can be construed as adaptive responses to the problems and dilemmas posed by this work context. There are many others of various theoretical persuasions (e.g., Larkin, 1973; Denscombe, 1980; Freedman et al, 1983; Gitlin, 1983; Zeichner & Tabachnick, in press) who have described how particular institutional characteristics of schools by themselves or as mediators of influence from the social, economic, and political context of schooling affect the character of teachers' work.

Despite all of these attempts to conceptualize school structure and to examine the perspectives of teachers in relation to specific institutional characteristics, Schlechty (1976, p. 83) has concluded that "there currently exists no adequate description or formulation of the structural characteristics of schools." What we have, according to Schlechty, is a variety of different lenses for viewing these structural characteristics which reflects the variety of sociological paradigms and theoretical frameworks which have been employed in the study of schools as organizations.

Pollard (1982), drawing upon the seminal work of Bachrach and Baratz (1962) on political decision making, proposes the construct of

"institutional bias" as a heuristic for analyzing school level influences on the work of teachers. According to Pollard, "institutional bias" represents a stability of understanding within particular schools which reflects the social values and educational ideas of those with the most influence within a school. This "institutional bias" derives inputs from teacher cultures existent within a school, from administrator perspectives, from parents, material and legal constraints, etc. and presents individual teachers with particular problematics despite oftentimes conflicting expectations which are exerted upon teachers within individual schools through both formal and informal channels. The influence of two specific events of institutional bias on the development of teacher perspectives will be described in the present paper: (1) inputs from colleagues; and (2) the influence of those with formal sanctioning power over teachers.

First, with regard to the influence of colleagues and "teacher cultures" on the development of teacher perspectives, Eddy (1969, p. 101) argues that even in the isolation of their own classrooms "new teachers entering the school soon learn that they are not alone, but part of a group of colleagues who attempt to guide and help them in many ways." Eddy feels that experienced colleagues are a constant source of help and guidance for beginning teachers and that through them neophythes develop world views of educational categories and processes consistent with that of other teachers in their schools.

> Like new workers in all settings, they are largely dependent on their more experienced colleagues to teach them the procedures for coping with the demands made upon them by their supervisors and subordinates . . . for the provision of education tools, for establishing work routines, for preparing classroom displays, and for preparing plans and filling out student records. (Eddy, 1969, p. 106)

In a similar vein, Waller (1932, p. 389) argues:

> The significant people for a school teacher are other teachers and by comparison with good standing in that fraternity, the good opinion of students is a small thing and of little price. A landmark in one's assimilation into the profession is that moment when he decides that only teachers are important.

Although there is substantial evidence that beginning teachers view their experienced colleagues as highly influential in the process of learning to teach (e.g., Grant & Zeichner, 1981; Howey, 1983), and some evidence which suggests that norms within the teacher peer group exert a powerful influence on teacher perspectives (e.g., Hoy, 1968), there is also evidence which suggests that the influence of "teacher cultures" is mediated by certain characteristics of beginning teachers (e.g., McArthur, 1978) and that formal attempts by teachers to influence the work of their colleagues occur only under particular conditions (e.g., McPherson, 1972; Newberry, 1977). The literature suggests that most of the influence of colleagues on the development of teacher perspectives, with the possible exception of these relatively few schools where norms of collegiality predominate (e.g., Little, 1982), probably occurs informally in a manner similar to Newberry's (1977, p. 14) description of the processes of influence in a study of first-year teachers:

> Focused conversation between beginning and experienced teachers on teaching practices was minimal, and the opportunity to observe other teachers at work was nonexistent. The beginning teachers' limited knowledge of other teachers' practices was based on information gained indirectly. They acquired this information informally as they visited and interacted with teachers outside actual classroom teaching situations. They heard comments in the staff room and looked at materials brought in by experienced teachers. They also heard comments and saw materials around the duplicating machine. Looking through open classroom doors or visiting other teachers' classrooms before or after school also informed beginners about the kind of work in which other teachers were currently engaged and the materials and techniques they used.

There is little question that the influence of colleagues needs to be taken into account in attempts to understand the origin of teacher perspectives despite the existence of an ethos of privacy and individualism within many schools (Denscombe, 1980). Given that teachers work under similar conditions, collegial influence is probably closely tied to the common circumstances that teachers face in the structural characteristics of schools and the ecological conditions of classrooms. It is also very clear, as studies by Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Metz (1978) have shown, that several diverse "teacher cultures" often exist even in a single school and that teachers may often face conflicting attempts by colleagues to influence them.

Edgar and Warren (1969) challenge this view of the strong socializing role of colleagues and argue that colleagues per se and the contextual effects of the workplace are less important in explaining the perspectives of teachers than are the attitudes of significant evaluators, those having power over teachers in terms of their ability to apply organizational sanctions. However, despite the existence of this one study which indicated that beginning teachers' perspectives toward autonomy in the teacher role were influenced by the perspectives of significant evaluators, the empirical literature does not generally confirm the view that teachers' superordinates contribute substantially to the development of teacher perspectives. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that teachers receive very little direct assistance and advice from their superiors (see Zeichner, 1983) and that teachers can frequently insulate themselves from the directives and sanctions of significant evaluators when they choose to do so (Zeichner & Tabachnick, in press). This is not to say that the classroom is an

impregnable sanctuary where teachers are free from administrative influence. The literature does suggest, however, that it is more through the structural imperatives of the job than through the influence of individual administrators that teaching perspectives are developed and maintained over time. It appears that individual administrator influence on teacher perspectives is exerted primarily through selection and recruitment rather than through socialization on the job.

At the cultural level of analysis (Pollard, 1982), an attempt is made to link the perspectives of individual teachers and the microlevel of the classroom and school to ideologies, practices, and material conditions at the macrolevel of society (e.g., inequalities in wealth and power). Here there have been two main types of analyses. First, those such as Wise (1979), Apple (1983), and Gitlin (1983) have explored how practices and policy initiatives outside of the school affect the material resources available to teachers and the character of the teacher's work. According to this view, teacher perspectives represent active and creative responses by teachers to constraints, dilemmas, and opportunities which are determined externally at a societal level and mediated through institutional structures and processes. Here studies have amply documented how such factors in the culture as a whole such as the bureaucratization of work, the deskilling of labor, and cultural stereotypes of women (see Feiman-Nemser & Floden, in press) have affected the circumstances of teachers' work although the linkages to the perspectives of individual teachers have not been as well documented as the influence on the institutional context of teaching.

A second type of analysis of the relationship between cultural forms and teacher perspectives has attempted to link the perspectives of

individual teachers to forms of meaning and rationality which are dominant in the society as a whole. Dale's (1977 a, b) arguments related to the development of a cognitive style of "liberal individualism," Giroux's (1980) analysis of the development of a "technocratic rationality," and Popkewitz's (in press) thesis regarding the influence of the professionalism of knowledge and the ideology of professionalism are all examples of attempts to demonstrate an effect of "cultural codes" on the development and nurturance of individual perspectives. As was pointed out above, however, there is very little, if any, empirical evidence available which substantiates these claims and which document that individual teachers actively incorporate forms of meaning and modes of rationality into their perspectives in ways consistent with the macrolevel theories.

Generally, the cultural level analysis has received the least amount of attention of the three levels in relation to the development of teacher perspectives. Although many of the analyses at a macrolevel are very persuasive and although some definite influences have been amply documented regarding the link between the cultural and the institutional contexts, there is much work that remains to be done regarding the influence of "cultural codes" and the material conditions of society on the socialization of teachers.

Stability and Change in the Development of Teaching Perspectives

Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) outline three scenarios, drawn from an analysis of the empirical literature, regarding the issue of stability and change in the development of teaching perspectives. According to this analysis, the commonly accepted view holds that teachers,

willingly or unwillingly, are cajoled and molded into shapes acceptable within their schools, shapes contrary to the perspectives that teachers allegedly developed during their training. Numerous studies of both elementary and secondary teachers in several countries have shown that beginning teachers experience statistically significant shifts in attitudes and perspectives during their first year. For example, teachers have been shown to shift in an authoritarian direction in their attitudes toward pupils (e.g., Liguana, 1970) and pupil control (e.g., Hoy, 1968); to shift their attitudes toward the teacher role (e.g., Edgar & Warren, 1969); and to generally shift from more "progressive" to "traditional" teaching perspectives (e.g., Hanson & Herrington, 1976) during this first year. Lacey (1977, p. 48) summarizes the impression given by much of this research as follows:

> The major findings of this research underline the importance of discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching. The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as they establish themselves in the profession away from the liberal ideas of their student days toward the traditional patterns in many schools.

Two different kinds of challenges have been raised in the literature regarding this view which emphasizes discontinuity in the development of teaching perspectives. First, Bartholomew (1976), Giroux (1980), and Tabachnick et al. (1979-80) have questioned the commonly accepted view that the socializing influence of the training colleges is more liberalizing than the socializing influence of the workplace. According to this view, the universities and schools exert similar pressures on the development of teaching perspectives and the university, contrary to its liberal rhetoric, legitimates and reinforces existing school practices.

A second challenge exemplified by the work of Lortie (1975), Mardle and Walker (1980), and Denscombe (1982) emphasizes the role of anticipatory socialization and the basic continuity of classroom experience (as a pupil and as a teacher) in influencing the development of perspectives. For example, Mardle and Walker (1980, p. 99) conclude:

> Indeed preservice experience may be more profoundly influential than either the efficacy of training or the colleague control of later years. . . . Teachers do not become resocialized during their course of training nor in the reality of the classroom, since in essence this is a reality which they never actually left.

Despite the existence of much empirical evidence which would support a view emphasizing discontinuity and change in the development of teaching perspectives, there is also empirical research, consistent with the arguments raised in the two challenges, which has documented a great deal of stability in perspectives between the end of preservice training and the end of the first year. Studies conducted by Petty and Hogben (1980), Power (1981), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (in press) all challenge the thesis of discontinuity and offer different explanations for the lack of changes in perspectives. According to the advocates of both of the challenges to the dominant scenario, the "progressive" to "traditional" shift in perspectives which has been documented in numerous studies of the socialization of beginning teachers is not a true shift in perspectives at all, but instead represents the removal of a veneer which students temporarily adopt in response to what they see as the progressive teaching of the university. Once prospective teachers leave training and the liberal <u>rhetoric</u> of the university, their perspectives, which remained latent throughout their professional training, are reaffirmed. Shipman's (1967), Lacey's (1977), and Tabachnick and Zeichner's (in press) documentation of the use of

"impression management" by prospective teachers during their training support this explanation regarding the essential stability in the development of perspectives in the face of the alleged shifts.

It should be noted that in both groups of studies, those that demonstrate changes and those which do not, some teachers experience significant shifts in attitudes and perspectives while other do not. Furthermore, among those whose perspectives apparently shift, the changes are often in different directions. These conclusions regarding change or stability in the development of teaching perspectives between the completion of training and the end of the first year have been based in almost all cases on analyses of central tendencies in groups of teachers studied. Also, few researchers in either camp have conducted analyses of observed teaching. With few exceptions, these studies have relied exclusively on teacher self-reports of their behavior or on attitude surveys for their data.

In the final analysis when attention is focused on the socialization of individual beginning teachers, neither group of studies is very helpful in illuminating how specific beginning teachers are socialized into particular settings. Although most commentators on teacher induction have concluded that the resolution of the issue of stability or change in the development of perspectives during the transition period is highly context dependent (e.g., Applegate et al., 1977; Tisher, 1982), the studies almost never provide specific information about the personal characteristics and life histories of individual teachers or information about the nature of the settings in which they work. Consequently, this research for the most part has not illuminated the particular individual characteristics and contextual factors which

are related to change or stability in particular cases. (See Zeichner, 1983, for a discussion of some of these factors.)

Finally, there has been very little attention given to the development of teaching perspectives beyond the first year(s) of teaching. Despite the existence of several credible theories regarding stages that teachers pass through over the course of a career (e.g., see Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1972; Burden, 1979; & Christiansen et al., 1983), we know relatively little about stability or change in the development of teaching perspectives and about the personal and contextual factors that affect the course of teacher development after the transition period. Research which focuses on the development of teaching perspectives at different points in teachers' careers would greatly enhance our understanding of the degree of continuity or discontinuity in teacher development throughout a career.

The Role of Individual Intent and Institutional Constraint in the Development of Teacher Perspectives

The problem of the development of teacher perspectives is one instance of the larger sociological question of the relationship between individuals and institutions or between action and structure (Giddens, 1979). Brim (1966, pp. 3-4) outlines two fundamental interests in the study of this problem.

> One interest is in how individuals adjust to society and how in spite of the influence of society they manage to be creative and to transform the social order into which they have been born. The other interest is in how society socializes the individual--how it transforms the raw material of biological man into a person suitable to perform the activities of society.

Historically, the study of the development of teacher perspectives has followed the latter of these traditions. Following Brim's (1966, p.

5) advice that "the inquiry at all times is concerned with how society changes the natural man, not how man changes his society," most studies of teacher socialization have portrayed teachers as relatively passive entities always giving way to institutional forces; have not made the internalization of institutional norms problematic; and have emphasized a consensus view of institutions which minimizes the influence of conflicting institutional pressures on teachers (Lacey, 1977).

Although a variety of factors at the classroom, institutional, and cultural levels, and factors within teachers' biographies, have been shown to be related to the development of teaching perspectives, teachers have not been viewed as active participants in determining the course of their development. On the one hand, teachers are viewed as "prisoners of the past" (of anticipatory socialization during childhood or preservice training); and on the other hand, they are seen as prisoners of the present (of pressures emanating from the workplace or the society).

There is ample evidence that neither of these views is very helpful in understanding the development of teaching perspectives; that conformity (to the past or present) is not the only outcome of socialization; and that even when conformity does occur, it occurs in different degrees, in different forms, and has different meanings for different individual teachers within different institutional contexts. A growing number of studies of occupational socialization in general (e.g., Olesen & Whittaker, 1968; Bucher & Stelling, 1977); of teacher socialization (e.g., Lacey, 1977; Zeichner & Tabachnick, in press); and of adult development (e.g., see Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983) have

demonstrated that the strong degree of determinism which pervades the literature on teacher socialization may be misguided.

One example of these emerging positions on teacher socialization as an interactive process is Lacey's (1977) conceptual model which is based on the view of a constant interplay between choice and constraint in the process of learning to teach. Lacey (1977) challenges Becker's (1964) view of "situational adjustment" (i.e., the individual turns him- or herself into the kind of person the situation demands) as the only possible outcome of occupational socialization and proposes the construct of social strategy as a heuristic device for understanding how and to what degree teachers conform to institutional pressures. Lacey defines a social strategy as a purposeful and active selection of actions and ideas by teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific contexts. He then identifies three different strategies that he claims are employed by teachers in the face of institutional constraints.

First, internalized adjustment refers to a strategy where individuals comply with an authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and where socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, strategic compliance refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not always act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs, and identifies those situations where conformity is essentially

an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of strategic redefinition refers to those situations where successful attempts to change are made by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and to introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.

Zeichner and Tabachnick (in press) have elaborated Lacey's (1977) interactive model by broadening the definition of "strategic redefinition" to include both those attempts which are successful and those which are not and by adding a temporal dimension to the model to enable longitudinal studies of teacher development. Lacey (1977), Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (in press), in documenting examples of both "strategic compliance" and "strategic redefinition" in the development of teaching perspectives, have provided some support for an interactive view of the socialization process. Although these studies have been recently criticized for underestimating the effects of anticipatory socialization (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, in press) and for overemphasizing the degree to which the mere presence of "strategic compliance" and "strategic redefinition" in a few cases poses a challenge to the dominant view of institutional determinism (Jordell, 1984), they do raise questions concerning the degree to which teachers readily and completely acquiesce to institutional demands which warrant further exploration.

Another line of empirical evidence which supports an interactive view of the development of teaching perspectives is that research which has viewed teacher development as an instance of adult development.

Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall (1983) and Oja (1980) summarize an impressive body of empirical data based on stage theories of cognitive development which demonstrates how the characteristics and purposes of individuals mediate institutional influences in determining the actions of teachers. This rapidly growing body of research, together with numerous interactions and studies of socialization into occupations other than teaching (e.g., Olesen & Whittaker, 1968), are consistent with the findings of Lacey (1977) and Zeichner and Tabachnick (in press). All of these strands of evidence justify a reexamination of the high degree of institutional determinism which has characterized explanations of the development of teaching perspectives. Although the development of teacher perspectives clearly entails more than simple expressions of the ideas, characteristics, and capabilities that teachers bring to the workplace (all of the external forces discussed earlier exert some influence), the strength and direction of teacher development is also clearly influenced to some degree by the purposes and intentions of individual teachers who do not simply acquiesce to the forces around them.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to assess the strength of the empirical evidence supporting different positions with regard to: (1) the nature of teacher perspectives at both an individual and an occupational level; (2) the influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms on the development of perspectives; (3) the degree to which the development of teaching perspectives is influenced by individual intent and institutional constraint; and (4) the degree of stability or

change in the development of teaching perspectives during the transition from training to the workplace. In doing so, evidence related to the socializing influence of early childhood experiences, preservice training and workplace characteristics at the classroom, school, and societal levels was addressed.

First, two views on the nature of teaching perspectives at both an individual and occupational level were considered. The dominant point of view assumes internal consistency among the various dimensions of individual teachers' perspectives and a high degree of homogeneity in perspectives in the occupation as a whole. It was argued that this view of the nature of teacher perspectives unjustifiably oversimplifies differences within and among teachers and that the assumption of occupational uniformity underestimates the degree of diversity in "teaching cultures" which has been documented even within single schools.

The assessment of the socializing influence of various individual institutional and cultural factors confirmed Lortie's (1973) assessment that the empirical evidence supports a variety of explanations for the development of teaching perspectives. First, with regard to the role of early childhood experience in teacher socialization, it was concluded that although research has confirmed the significance of pretraining influences in a general way, this support is largely indirect and does not substantiate any particular theoretical explanation. It was argued that much work remains to be done to clarify the particular nature of these pretraining influences.

When the evidence was examined with regard to the influence of preservice training on the development of perspectives, it was concluded that the dominant view of preservice training as a weak intervention

fails to consider the effects of the hidden curriculum of teacher education programs and that the effects of preservice training may in fact be greater than has often been thought to be the case. It was further concluded that most of the arguments related to the impact of the hidden curriculum of teacher training have not been substantiated to date by empirical evidence and that studies need to be initiated which consider whether in fact prospective teachers incorporate elements into their teaching perspectives in ways consistent with the theoretical arguments. Finally, with regard to the influence of field experiences in preservice training, it was concluded that these experiences have different effects upon the development of teaching perspectives depending upon the nature of individual and program characteristics, but that research has not illuminated the particular factors (both individual and social) which are related to the development of particular kinds of teaching perspectives during field experiences.

The analysis of workplace influences at three different levels revealed that there is some evidence in the literature supporting the view that pupils, the ecology of the classroom, colleagues, and institutional characteristics of schools all play significant roles in the development of teaching perspectives. The specific nature of these influences was described (e.g., the informal and contradictory nature of colleague influence) together with areas where more research is particularly needed (e.g., how individual characteristics of pupils and teachers mediate pupil influences on teacher perspectives). It was also concluded that research has not generally confirmed Edgar and Warren's (1969) claim that "significant evaluators" play a substantial role in the development of perspectives. Finally, it was concluded that

although some evidence has been accumulated related to the influence of various factors in the culture as a whole (e.g., stereotypes of women) on the conditions of teachers' work, the links between these cultural factors and the perspectives of individual teachers have not been firmly established. It was argued that the cultural level of analysis has received very little attention to date and that much empirical work remains to be done regarding the influence of "cultural codes" and the material conditions of society on the socialization of individual teachers.

When the question of stability or change in the development of teaching perspectives was considered, it was concluded that the resolution of this issues in the case of specific teachers is highly context dependent. It was argued that the extant research has generally failed to illuminate the particular individual characteristics and contextual factors which are related to stability or change in specific cases; nor has it addressed the issue of stability or change in the development of teaching perspectives beyond the first year(s) of teaching. Longitudinal studies which consider the ways in which specific individual and contextual characteristics influence the development of teaching perspectives at different points in teachers' careers are needed.

Evidence was also considered regarding the degree to which individual intent and institutional constraint influence the development of teaching perspectives. Recent research on occupational socialization, teacher socialization, and adult development was cited which challenges the strong degree of institutional determinism that pervades the literature and arguments were offered for the adoption of a more <u>interactive</u> view of teacher development.

Finally, it becomes increasingly clear as a result of the analysis of the evidence related to all of these issues, that there is no one explanation which can account for the development of teaching perspectives and the degree of change or stability in these perspectives over a career. Although various generalizations can now be formulated on the basis of the available empirical literature regarding central tendencies in the development of teaching perspectives, the development of perspectives by individual teachers is greatly influenced by the predispositions, characteristics, and capabilities of teachers who differ from one another and the characteristics of the settings in which they work, settings that pose different constraints and opportunities for action. Research on the development of teaching perspectives must clearly pay more attention in the future to the uniqueness as well as the commonalities in teacher development. The dominant practice of describing only central tendencies in the development of teaching perspectives can not illuminate the diversity that unquestionably characterizes the socialization of teachers and the occupational group. A greater understanding of the socializing conditions of particular schools and of the ways in which individual teachers develop particular kinds of teaching perspectives is a key to understanding the most likely roads to strengthening and improving both teacher education and the quality of school programs.

References

Anderson, R. (1959). Learning in discussions: A resume of the authoritarian-democratic studies. Harvard Educational Review, 201-215.

Apple, M. (1983). Curricular form and the logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Applegate, J. et al. (1977). The first-year teacher study. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 766)

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. (1962). Two faces of power. American Political Science Review, 56, 947-952.

Barr, R., & Duffy, G. (1978). Teachers' conceptions of reading: The evolution of a research study (Research Series No. 17). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & J. M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Becker, H. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 40-53.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bennett, N. (1976). Teaching styles of pupil progress. London: Open Books.

Berger, P., & Luchmann, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen.

Brim, O. (1966). Socialization through the life cycle. In O. Brim & S. Wheeler, (Eds.), Socialization after childhood: Two essays. New York: Wiley.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. (1981). Student characteristics and teaching. New York: Longman.

Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. (1977). Becoming professional. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Burden, P. (1979). Teachers' perceptions of the characteristics and influences on their personal and professional development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 5404-A (University Microfilms No. 8008776).

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. (1979). Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Christiansen, J., Burke, P., Fessler, R., & Hagstrom, D. (1983). Stages of teachers' careers: Implications for staff development. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Copeland, W. (1980). Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 18, 194-199.

Dale, R. (1977a). Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Dale, R. (1977b). The structural context of teaching. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press.

Denscombe, M. (1980). The work context of teaching: An analytic framework for the study of teachers in classrooms. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 1, 279-292.

Denscombe, M. (1982). The hidden pedagogy and its implications for teacher training. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 3, 249-265.

Doyle, W. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. Theory into Practice, 18, 138-144.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1975). Classroom ecology: Some concerns about a neglected dimension of research on teaching. Contemporary Education, 46, 183-188.

Dreeben, R. (1970). The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.

Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dreitzel, H. P. (1973). Childhood and socialization. New York: Macmillan.

Eddy, E. (1969). Becoming a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edgar D., and Warren, R. (1969). Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 42, 386-399.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (in press). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), The third handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Fenstermacher, G. (1980). What needs to be known about what teachers need to know? In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Fiedler, M. (1975). Bidirectionality of influence in classroom interaction. Journal of Educationl Psychology, 67, 735-744.

Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Boles, K. (1983). Teaching: An imperiled profession. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 207-226.

Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ginsburg, M. (1984, April). Reproduction and contradictions in preservice teachers' encounters with professionalism. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 162, 5-27.

Gitlin, A. (1983). School structure and teachers' work. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Goodlad, J. (1982). Let's get on with the reconstruction. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 19-20.

Gracey, H. (1972). Curriculum or craftsmanship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grant, C. (1981). Education that is multicultural and teacher preparation: An examination from the perspectives of preservice students. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 95-101.

Grant, C., & Zeichner, K. (1981). Inservice support for first-year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14, 99-111.

Gray, J., & Satterly, D. (1981). Formal or informal? A reassessment of the British evidence. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51, 187-196.

Griffin, G. et al. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Haberman, M. (1981). The legacy of teacher education, 1980-2000. Hunt lecture presented at the annual meeting of AACTE, Houston, Texas.

Haller, E. (1967). Pupils' influences in teacher socialization: A socio-linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 40, 316-333.

Hammersley, M. (1977a). Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. (1977b). The social location of teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press.

Hanson, D., & Herrington, M. (1976). From college to classroom: The probationary year. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hodges, C. (1982). Implementing methods: If you can't blame the cooperating teacher, whom can you blame? Journal of Teacher Education, 33, 25-29.

Hogben, D., & Lawson, M. (1983). Attitudes of secondary school teacher trainees and their practice teaching supervisors. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9, 249-263.

Howey, K. (1983). Teacher education: An overview. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), Teacher education: A look ahead. New York: Longman.

Hoy, W. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 66, 89-93.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jordell, K. (1984, April). Teacher socialization: Towards solving the riddle? A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Katz, L. (1972). Developmental stages of pre-school teachers. Elementary School Journal, 73, 50-54.

Katz, L., & Raths, J. (1982). The best of intentions for the education of teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 4, 8-16.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Larkin, R. (1973). Contextual influences on teacher leadership styles. Sociology of Education, 46, 471-479.

Liguana, J. (1970). What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers? Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Lortie, D. (1973). Observations of teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maddox, H. (1968). A descriptive study of teaching practice. Educational Review, 20, 177-190.

Mardle G., & Walker, M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies. London: Croom Helm.

McArthur, J. (1978). What does teaching do to teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 89-103.

McIntyre, D. J. (1983). Field experiences in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse in Teacher Education.

McPherson, G. (1972). Small town teacher. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Metz, M. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Newberry, J. (1977, April). The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York City. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 299).

Noble, C., & Nolan, J. (1976). Effect of student verbal behavior on classroom teacher behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 342-346.

Oja, S. N. (1980). Adult development is implicit in staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 1.

Olesen, V., & Whittaker, E. (1968). The silent dialogue. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. (1980). Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 6, 51-61.

Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 3, 19-37.

Popkewitz, T. (in press). Ideology and social formation in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education.

Power, P. (1981). Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 25, 288-296.

Sarason, S., Davidson, K., & Blatt, B. (1962). The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem. New York: Wiley.

Schlechty, P. (1976). Teaching and social behavior: Toward an organizational theory of instruction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. (1975). Education and social control. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shipman, M. (1967). Theory and practice in the education of teachers. Educational Research, 9, 208-212.

Sirotnik, K. (1983). What you see is what you get: Consistency, persistency and mediocrity in classrooms. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 16-31.

Sprinthall, N., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner: A cognitive-developmental view. In G. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development. The eighty-second yearbook of NSSE (Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephens, J. (1967). The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. (1979-80). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 10, 12-29.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (in press). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education.

Tisher, R. (1982, March). Teacher induction: An international perspective on research and programs. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Travers, R. (1971). Some further reflections on the nature of a theory of instruction. In I. Westbury & A. Bellack (Eds.), Research into classroom processes. New York: Teachers College Press.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley.

Westbury, I. (1973). Conventional classrooms, "open" classrooms, and the technology of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5.

Wise, A. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wright, B. (1959). Identification and becoming a teacher. Elementary School Journal, 361-373.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. (1967). The childhood romance theory of teacher development. School Review, 25, 123-154.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 26, 183-193.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. (1984, January). The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. A paper presented at the annual meeting of Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Zeichner, K. (in press). Preparation for elementary school teaching. In P. Burke & R. Heideman (Eds.), Teacher competence: Issues in career-long teacher education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas.

Zeichner K., & Grant, C. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1, 198-314.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 7-11.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (in press). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning techers. Journal of Education for Teaching.

Notes

[1]See Hammersley (1977a); Berlak and Berlak (1981); and Tabachnick and Zeichner (in press) for examples of specific dimensions which have been investigated within the rubric of teaching perspectives.

CONTENT AND CONTEXTS: NEGLECTED ELEMENTS IN STUDIES OF STUDENT TEACHING AS AN OCCASION FOR LEARNING TO TEACH

Kenmeth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin-Madison

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1985.

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-84-0008). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

Abstract

This paper argues that studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach have mistakenly ignored the role of program content and contexts in the socialization of prospective teachers. A typology for distinguishing among the curricula of student teaching programs in studies of student teacher socialization is proposed based on Zeichner's (1983) paradigms of teacher education and Lanier's (1984) description of alternative conceptions of the teacher's role. Illustrations are also provided of how knowledge about the various contexts of student teaching can be incorporated into studies of student teacher socialization. It is concluded that we will only begin to understand more about the role of student teaching in teacher development when we begin to take more of the substance and ecological reality of student teaching into account in research studies.

CONTENT AND CONTEXTS: NEGLECTED ELEMENTS IN STUDIES OF STUDENT TEACHING AS AN OCCASION FOR LEARNING TO TEACH

Koehler (1985) has observed that it has become fashionable for reviews of research on teacher education to begin with a lament concerning the lack and/or poor quality of studies on particular aspects of preservice teacher education. According to Koehler (1985, p. 23), these quality complaints typically conclude with the assertion that "there are lots of studies, but they do not add up to anything; they are piecemeal, particularistic." By necessity, the present paper will begin its examination of the literature on student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach by conforming to this convention identified by Koehler. Studies of the role of student teaching in learning to teach, by any account, have not provided us with much information that is useful for policy decisions related to student teaching programs. The point of this paper, however, is to identify some of the reasons why these studies as a group have generally added up to so little to date and to offer some conceptual and methodological guidelines which can be utilized in the future to overcome some of the limitations evident in the extant research.

Student Teaching as an Occasion for Learning to Teach

Doyle (1985) has observed that research on how teachers learn to teach has begun to emerge as a major focus for research in teacher education. Student teaching has clearly been the most widely studied aspect of learning to teach at the preservice level (Feiman-Nemser,

1983). However, despite the existence of literally hundreds of studies which have examined the role of student teaching in the development of teachers, there continues to be a great deal of disagreement and debate over the degree to which student teaching influences the process of learning to teach (i.e., its potency as an intervention) and over the specific nature of its influence (e.g., the specific individual and institutional factors which are most salient in influencing socialization outcomes) (see Zeichner, 1985 a).

Generally, however, despite disagreements over specific issues such as the socializing role of the cooperating teacher, most reviews which have analyzed studies on the role of student teaching in learning to teach have consistently characterized the knowledge base related to the socializing impact of these experiences as weak, contradictory, and ambiguous (Davies & Amershek, 1969; Peck & Tucker, 1973; Zeichner, 1980; Griffin et al., 1980; Feiman-Nemser, 1983). Without exception, those who have attempted to summarize what the extant research has to say about the role of student teaching in learning to teach, have also raised many serious questions about the ways in which research in this area has been conceptualized and conducted and have offered many specific proposals aimed at fostering a major restructing of the dominant research approach in this area.

Rather than attempting to provide yet another compilation of the findings of specific studies on student teaching, this paper will focus instead on identifying two of the most serious flaws in research on student teaching to date and on offering some guidelines, both conceptual and methodological, which can be used to conduct studies on student teaching that can potentially generate findings related to the

socializing role of student teaching that will be more useful than what exists currently for making policy decisions related to student teaching programs.

The general argument is that the failure of studies to attend to the complex, dynamic, and multidimensional reality of student teaching, the "ecology" of student teaching (Zeichner, 1985 b), is a major reason for the current unsatisfactory state of our knowledge base related to the influence of student teaching on the process of learning to teach. Specifically, it will be argued that the lack of attention to the content and contexts of student teaching have been two of the most serious flaws in the research in this area.

The Ecology of Student Teaching

Bronfenbrenner (1976) outlines what he considers to be the basic elements of the "ecology of education" and argues that education research which seeks to understand how people learn in educational settings must attend to two sets of relations. First, research must be concerned with understanding the relations between the characteristics of learners and the surroundings in which they live and work (person-environment interactions). Second, research must investigate the relations and interconnections that exist between the various environments themselves (environment-environment interactions). This theme about the necessity for educational research to attend to the ecological characteristics of the learning process has frequently been reiterated by those who are concerned with understanding the processes of learning to teach (e.g., Doyle, 1977; Copeland, 1981; Zimpher et al., 1980).

Others, such as Popkewitz et al. (1979) and Tabachnick (1981), have added to this concern about attending to the variety of simultaneous influences on teacher development at several levels, the concern that research must seek to investigate the processes of teacher development as they evolve over time. For example, Tabachnick (1981) characterizes experiences in teacher education as "dynamic social events" possessing the dual characteristics of "embeddedness" and "becoming" and feels that research on teacher development must seek to understand patterns of interaction between the intentions that participants bring to an event, the physical and social environments which exist during the unfolding of an event, and the ethical-psychological environments that develop as individual participants create and give meanings to the patterns of interaction that occur. Tabachnick (1981) argues that the processes of teacher development will inevitably entail unanticipated as well as anticipated "outcomes" and that in order to understand both the event and the development of participants one needs to be able to document the evolution of an event.

Finally, the works of Lacey (1977), Doyle (1977), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) emphasize the importance of viewing patterns of interaction and influence between and among participants and social contexts as reciprocal in nature. The studies of Nerenz (1980) and Rosenfeld (1969), empirically document that influence during field experiences in teacher education does not always follow predicted directions and that those with the least formal power (i.e., the teacher education students) sometimes exert influence over those who are supposed to be influencing them and over the settings in which they work. In summary, an ecological approach to research in teacher

education requires that studies: (1) seek to understand the simultaneous influence of a variety of people and factors under particular environmental conditions at several levels of analysis; (2) document the evolution of an experience and patterns of influence over time; (3) view influence in relation to teacher development as reciprocal in nature.

This ecological perspective toward research on teacher education has recently been set forth as a necessary ingredient in studies of field experiences. Consistent with Feiman-Nemser's (1983) general charge to researchers to pay closer attention to the content and context of field experiences, Hersh et al. (1982) have outlined the basic elements that need to be considered in research which attends to the complex ecology of field experiences. Hersh et al. (1982), in defining the ecology of field experiences as "the complex set of relationships among program features, settings, and people," argue that research on field experiences needs to investigate:

(1) The structure and content of a field experience program. This entails an examination of both the goals and substance of a program as viewed by program designers and an understanding of how a program is actually implemented (its curriculum-in-use).

(2) The characteristics of placement sites. This includes an examination of the classrooms, schools, and communities in which field experiences are carried out.

(3) The relationship between education students and other people. This presupposes an understanding of the characteristics and dispositions, abilities, and behaviors of both individual students and those with whom they interact.

The present paper will examine how the failure of studies to attend to the content and contexts of student teaching (Nos. 1 and 2 above) has limited the usefulness of their findings. This paper does not address problems in this research related to the lack of attention to individuals (their predispositions, characteristics, and capabilities); nor does it address the problematic aspects of how developmental outcomes have been defined and assessed in studies of student teaching (see Zeichner, 1985 b, for discussion of both of these issues). Both of these areas will also need to be addressed before studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach will fulfill the criteria set forth for studies by Hersh et al. (1982).

The Content of Student Teaching

It is clear from any examination of the literature on student teaching that there is no agreed-upon definition of the experience and that there is a great deal of variety in the ways in which student teaching is conceptualized, organized, and actually conducted even within a single institution. Beyond general agreement over student teaching as being the period "of guided teaching when the student takes increasing responsibility for the work with a given group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks" (Flowers et al., 1948, p. 21), there are clearly many alternatives existing in practice regarding the content and goals of student teaching programs, their structural and organizational characteristics, their relation to campus-based courses, patterns for involving supervisory personnel, and in the roles which are assumed by student teachers (Yates & Johnson, 1981).

However, despite the overwhelming evidence of the wide variety of curricula, organizational patterns, and role configurations in student teaching programs, studies which have investigated the role of student teaching in learning to teach have not for the most part provided us with the kind of information about programs which accounts for this heterogeneity; nor have they provided us with information which attends to the complex interactions among the individual components within any given program.

Several different concerns have been raised in the literature regarding the treatment of the content of student teaching programs in individual studies. On the one hand, Gaskell (1975) and Ryan (1982) have criticized the common practice of examining changes in the attitudes and actions of student teachers as a result of their participation in a "treatment" which is described simply as "student teaching." They argue that this lumping together of all of the constituent parts of student teaching masks the influence of particular dimensions of programs or of particular types of programs. As a result, they argue, we frequently see reports of particular changes or of the lack of changes resulting from participation in "student teaching," but we are rarely given any insight into how and why student teachers are affected in particular ways by program characteristics.

> The investigators view student teaching as a simple treatment and do not accurately describe it or discuss what parts of the experience are important . . . . Student teaching is a different experience in different institutions. Without an accurate description of the experience, the studies cannot be useful. (Gaskell, 1975, p. 21)

A different criticism of the treatment of the content of student teaching in individual studies is concerned with the also common tendency to examine isolated bits of a student teaching program in

relation to developmental outcomes. Hersh et al. (1982) argue, for example, that these attempts to explain the influence of field experiences on the basis of a few isolated factors ignore the complex ecology of field experiences. As a result, they argue, we are also given little insight from such studies as to what particular components of programs or types of programs influence the developmental outcomes. The argument here is that we cannot understand the influence of any particular factor in student teaching (e.g., the role of the cooperating teacher) without also understanding the influence of all of the other factors (e.g., the curriculum of a program, the characteristics of placement sites) which are intimately linked to this one factor.

> Different aspects of teacher training programs and relationships among participants in specific settings act as simultaneous influences on the student teachers. This phenomenon creates a complex ecology that is often masked by research attempts to explain the effect of single factors in the setting. (Hersh et al., 1982, p. 1817)

A final criticism of the treatment of the content of student teaching programs in individual studies is related to the lack of attention in most studies to a program's curriculum-in-use. Zeichner (1980) has argued that the characteristics of field-based programs are not to be found in public statements of intention, but through an examination of the experiences themselves. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1982) elaborate on this theme when they argue that one cannot assume that all field experiences pose the same constraints and opportunities for all student teachers and that the socialization of student teachers takes the same form and has the same meaning for all students even within a single program.

Fullan and Pomfret (1977) conclude with regard to curriculum and instruction generally that the process of implementation is not simply

an extension of the planning process and that it is inappropriate to view the move from the drawing board to the school and classroom as unproblematic. Similarly, Parlett and Hamilton (1976, p. 145) have noted that,

> An instructional system, when adopted, undergoes modifications that are rarely trivial. The instructional system may remain as a shared idea, abstract model, slogan or shorthand, but it assumes a different form in every situation. Its constituent elements are emphasized or de-emphasized, expanded or truncated, as teachers, administrators, technicians, and students interpret and reinterpret the instructional system for their particular setting. In practice, objectives are commonly reordered, redefined, abandoned, or forgotten. The original "ideal" formulation ceases to be accurate, or indeed, of much relevance.

There is some evidence from studies of student teaching which supports these arguments and which underlies the inappropriateness of deriving an understanding of a student teaching program solely from statements of goals and from instructional plans. For example, Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981), Goodman (1984), and Zeichner and Liston (in press) have shown that even when the designers of field-based programs have articulated a specific emphasis, the actual implementation of a program reflects a diversity of orientations as the diverse perspectives of specific individuals are brought to bear on the coherent instructional plan in different contexts. In all of these studies there were differences in the degree to which various program goals and requirements were implemented in various classrooms. Similar evidence can also be found in Griffin et al.'s (1983) comprehensive study of student teaching programs at two universities.

In summary, three major criticisms have been raised in the literature with regard to how the content of student teaching is handled in studies of student teaching's role in learning to teach: (1) studies

typically focus on student teaching as an undefined "treatment" and do not describe the particular orientations and curricula of programs; (2) studies focus on describing the socializing role of isolated bits of student teaching programs and do not attend to the complex ecology of student teaching; (3) even studies which do describe the content of a program focus on the instructional plan for a program and do not usually attend to its curriculum-in-use.

Zeichner's (1985 b) analysis of a group of 16 representative studies of student teaching's role in the development of teachers[1] examined the ways in which the content of student teaching is typically handled in individual studies. As a result of this analysis, Zeichner (1985 b) concluded that despite the fact that several of the studies provided relatively detailed descriptions of the purposes, content, and organization of courses or seminars which complemented student teaching, only three of the 16 studies provided any information about the organization and structure of the student teaching experience under study such as descriptions of when it took place (e.g., the senior year), its length, and the number of classroom placements involved. Most important for our purposes here, <u>none</u> of the 16 studies offered any information at all about the content or curriculum of the student teaching program (e.g., expectations and requirements for students). Thus, while all of the 16 studies examined various other influences on student teacher attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (e.g., seminars, cooperating teachers), the orientation, substance, and content of the program itself for the most part remained undefined. Consequently, these studies present us with a lot of specific information about the influence (or lack of influence) of cooperating teachers, university supervisors,

etc., but give us little, if any, insight into how the particular dimensions and orientations of the programs studied contributed to the developmental outcomes.

One reason why researchers have tended to pay so little attention to the content of student teaching programs in studies of student teaching's role in learning to teach is because teacher educators who conduct these programs typically give little attention to issues related to the substance of programs as well.

> While all colleges make some sort of statement in their prospectuses about the broad aims of the theoretical elements in their courses, few venture to do the same in relation to practical teaching. (Stones & Morris, 1972, p. 127)

The focus in studies of student teaching on such factors as the length of a program, the number of classroom placements, the time of year of the placements (fall or spring), all of which ignore the substance and curriculum of the experience, is merely a reflection of the way in which student teaching is described and discussed in the teacher education community. A good example of this lack of attention to program substance can be found in the nature of recent state department of education mandates regarding required numbers of clock hours in field experience programs.

A Typology for Defining the Content of Student Teaching Programs

One way to think about alternatives in the content of student teaching programs is to focus on the curricular orientations of particular programs and on the conceptions of the teacher's role to which these orientations are linked. Zeichner (1983) has outlined four "paradigms" of teacher education which are represented in contemporary debates in the field and which give some guidance to the conduct of teacher

education programs. Evidence of all four of these orientations (behavioristic, personalistic, traditional-craft, and inquiry-oriented) can be found in various approaches to organizing the content of student teaching programs (Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). When linked with alternative conceptions of the teacher's role, such as those provided by Lanier (1984), they provide one way of distinguishing among the instructional plans of student teaching programs.

A "behavioristic" orientation to teacher education emphasizes the mastery of specific and observable teaching skills and behaviors which are assumed (often on the basis of teacher effectiveness research) to be related to particular aspects of pupil learning. Here the criteria by which success is to be measured are made explicit at the onset, and performance at a prespecified level of mastery is assumed to be the most valid measure of teacher competence. Zeichner (1983) describes this general approach to teacher education as one where the curriculum of a program would be highly specified in advance ("received") and where there is a general acceptance of the current institutional form and social context of schooling ("certain").

This orientation to the conduct of teacher education is aimed at preparing teachers who are first and foremost "skilled performers." According to Lanier (1984, p. 6), in this conception of the teacher's role "the most important pedagogical skills are imbedded in the behavioral performance of smoothly orchestrated routines and actions." Here, as with the other conceptions of the teacher's role, it is important to note that an approach is not defined by a total neglect of the issues emphasized in other approaches and that the various conceptions of the teacher's role (as is the case for the paradigms as well) are not

mutually exclusive. All of the conceptions give some attention to technical skill of performance in teaching, to the exercise of informed human judgment, and to unique personal qualities and human characteristics. According to Lanier (1984, pp. 6-7), "Each conception is considered unique because of the primary questions and issues that were placed in the foreground, as opposed to the background." Examples of student teaching programs which emphasize the issues and concerns characteristic of a behavioristic approach to teacher education can be found in the numerous competency-based student teaching programs which have been described in the literature (Yates & Johnson, 1981).

A "traditional-craft" orientation to teacher education and an approach to student teaching as an apprenticeship emphasize the accumulated wisdom of experienced practitioners. Here the central concern is to bring to focal awareness the subsidiary knowledge that constitutes good practice, and a master apprentice relationship is seen as the proper vehicle for transmitting the "cultural knowledge" possessed by good teachers to the novice. It is further assumed that much of this accumulated practical knowledge about teaching is tacit and not amenable to the kind of specification that is characteristic of "behavioristic" approaches. According to this view, the whole is more than the sum of the parts, and mastery of a repertoire of technical skills in teaching does not guarantee that the novice will be able to make proper judgments about what ought to be done in particular situations. In fact, advocates of this view often argue that close scrutiny of the particulars of a comprehensive entity such as teaching (as is the case in competency-based programs) runs the risk of destroying the integrity of the entity itself.

Zeichner (1983) has described this general approach to teacher education as "received" in that students are viewed as essentially passive recipients of the accumulated knowledge about teaching and as one where the problem of teacher education is for the most part defined within an educational and social context that is accepted as given ("certain"). This conception of teacher education, like a "behavioristic" approach, can be most easily linked to Lanier's (1984) notion of the teacher as a "skilled performer" where the central concern is the smoothly orchestrated performance of routines and actions.

Despite the reluctance of many teacher educators to openly affiliate themselves with a "traditional-craft" conception of student teaching, this approach of "model the master" (Stones & Morris, 1972) is probably the dominant orientation to student teaching today. Here there is little attempt to explicitly define a curriculum for student teaching (or a set of specific teaching competencies to be mastered), and students are implicitly expected to acquire the accumulated knowledge of experienced practitioners through observation, imitation, and repeated practice of actions and routines modeled by cooperating teachers.

A "personalistic" orientation to teacher education focuses on developing prospective teachers as persons and emphasizes the reorganization of perceptions and beliefs over the mastery of specific behaviors, skills, and content knowledge. Here student teaching is viewed as a time for providing opportunities to display, reorganize, and refine abilities latent in a student, and teaching effectiveness is attributed largely to the characteristics and qualities of individuals as persons.

According to this view, teacher education is a form of adult development, a process of "becoming" rather than merely a process of

learning how to teach. The central problem within this approach is how to bring about appropriate shifts in perceptions and meanings, and teaching competence is defined in terms of particular conceptions of "psychological maturity."[2] The behaviors of teachers and the environments they create are assumed to result largely from the particular meanings and purposes that teachers hold, and the specification of a particular set of behaviors for all teachers to master is viewed as antithetical to the development of mature and competent teachers (Combs, 1972).

Zeichner (1983) has characterized this approach as "reflexive" in that "personalistic" programs seek to be responsive to prospective teachers' own definitions of their learning needs and students are viewed as active agents in determining the substance and direction of their education for teaching. However, as is the case in the "behavioristic" and "traditional-craft" paradigms, the problem of teacher education is largely defined within an educational and social context which is accepted as given ("certain"). Success within a "personalistic" orientation is assessed primarily in terms of effects upon individuals and not in terms of effects upon social systems.

The "personalistic" orientation to teacher education can be most readily linked to Lanier's (1984) conception of the role of teacher as an "effective person," where the most important pedagogical skills are seen to be imbedded in unique personal qualities and human characteristics. Examples of "personalistic" approaches to the organization of the content for student teaching can be found in the humanistic program described by Goodman (1984) and the personalistic program described by Fuller (1972).

An "inquiry-oriented" approach to teacher education stresses the development of orientations and skills which will enable prospective teachers to exercise reasoned judgments about which educational goals are to be achieved and which teaching methods and contexts are conducive to the achievement of these ends. Here there is also a concern for enabling prospective teachers to suspend judgment about some aspect of teaching and its contexts to consider alternatives to conventional practice (Tom, 1985). There is also a concern for helping prospective teachers to master various models of inquiry (e.g., curriculum analysis, action research) through which various arenas of the problematic are explored. The development of technical skill in teaching and the mastery of content knowledge is also addressed in this approach within a broad framework of critical inquiry and is viewed as a process of mastery which will enable the achievement of worthwhile ends.

As Feiman (1980) points out, this orientation views the prospective teacher as an active agent in his or her own preparation for teaching and assumes that the more a teacher is aware of the origins and consequences of his or her actions and of the material and ideological realities which influence them, the greater the likelihood that he or she can control and change both the actions and situations. Here there is a fundamental concern for helping teachers assume a central role in shaping the direction of educational environments according to purposes of which they are aware and which can be justified on instrumental, educational, and moral grounds.

Zeichner (1983) has characterized the curriculum within this orientation as "reflexive." As is the case in the "personalistic" approach, the knowledge and skills to be mastered by prospective

teachers are not fully specified in advance and an attempt is made to respond to the self-perceived needs and concerns of students. However, while students play active roles in determining the substance of their preparation for teaching, "meeting the needs" of prospective teachers is not the central concern. The teaching of technical skills associated with inquiry (e.g., observation skills) and the fostering of a disposition toward critical inquiry ("a critical spirit") becomes the axis around which the preparation revolves. Finally, an "inquiry-oriented" approach to teacher education, unlike the other three approaches, is characterized by a "problematic" (as opposed to "certain") stance toward the institutional form and sound context of schooling. However, as Tom (1985) points out, approaches within the "inquiry-oriented" orientation differ substantially on their definition of the "arena of the problematic". Consequently only some of the approaches to inquiry-oriented teacher education can be characterized as problematic according to Zeichner's (1983) definition.

An "inquiry-oriented" approach to teacher education can be most readily linked to Lanier's (1984) conception of the teacher as "a professional decision maker."[3] Here the most important pedagogical skills are thought to be imbedded in the exercise of informed human judgment "that is grounded in a substantive body of formal and practical knowledge concerning the human endeavors of teaching, learning, and schooling" (Lanier, 1984, p. 6). Examples of inquiry-oriented approaches to the content of student teaching can be found in the programs described by Zeichner and Liston (1985), Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977), and by Feiman (1979). All of these programs view settings for student teaching as social laboratories for study as well as places for

practice and seek to reinforce the view that student teaching is a time for continued learning about teaching and schooling and for establishing pedagogical habits of self-directed growth rather than as merely a time for the application and demonstration of previously acquired knowledge and skills.

All of these programs involve an inquiry component in addition to the usual components designed to enable students to gradually assume the teacher's role; and the teacher role to be assumed emphasizes the decision-making aspects of the teacher's work.

This framework for distinguishing among approaches to the content of student teaching offers some potential for use in studies of student teaching for differentiating programs from one another. Programs could be described in relation to their underlying conceptions of teacher education and the teacher's role and in terms of their curricular emphases (see Figure 1), and the influence of different types of programs could be explored as one contributing factor to the process of learning to teach. As was mentioned earlier, it is important for researchers to go beyond descriptions of a program's instructional plan to provide analyses of salient aspects of its curriculum-in-use. Also, the effects of different types of programs are likely to vary depending upon the contexts in which they are acted out and upon varying characteristics, predispositions, and abilities of specific individuals. The typology outlined here is intended only as a vehicle for assessing how the content of a student teaching program contributes to the process of learning to teach.

/ Insert Figure 1 about here /

The contradictory nature of the findings from research on student teaching (Zeichner, 1980) has clearly suggested that differences in program content are one factor in influencing the nature of developmental outcomes. Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984), for example, have attempted to explain their findings related to the lack of change in student teacher perspectives partly in terms of the nature of the programs which they studied (e.g., students' self-selection of placement sites together with various inquiry-oriented program components). Other examples of attempts to explain developmental outcomes in terms of particular program characteristics or types of programs can be found in the studies of Gaskell (1975), Connor and Smith (1967), and Griffin et al. (1983). It is likely that at least some of the points of difference in debates over the socializing role of student teaching (see Zeichner, 1980) are related to differences in socialization attributable to program features.

The typology proposed here is viewed as only a beginning attempt to develop a framework for describing the substance of student teaching programs. Other approaches to differentiating the content of student teaching programs have been proposed periodically since Dewey's (1904) classic distinction between the "laboratory" and "apprenticeship" orientations, and more work clearly needs to go on to refine and elaborate a set of dimensions for differentiating program content. One obvious weakness in the typology proposed here is related to the fact that differences within the orientations are frequently very great. This is especially true with regard to the inquiry-oriented approach to student teaching. For example, Tom's (1985) analysis of alternative conceptions of inquiry-oriented teacher education demonstrates the

importance of being able to specify not only the general approach, but also specific emphases within an approach. Examining the socializing influences of student teaching according to general program orientations without further specifying the specific emphases within an approach may not add much to our understanding beyond the current practice of treating "student teaching" as an undifferentiated entity. One function of research on student teaching in the future could be to contribute to this process of typology building by providing empirically-based descriptions of salient program dimensions.

The Contexts of Student Teaching

The second aspect of the ecology of student teaching to be discussed in the present paper is the nature of the classrooms and schools and communities in which student teachers work. Becher and Ade (1982, p. 25) point out what should be obvious, "By their very nature, no two placement sites are alike. All vary on a number of dimensions, and it is likely that they may have potentially different effects and make potentially different contributions to a student's growth." Similarly, McIntyre (1983, p. 16) argues that, "To understand the field experience, one must assay the elementary and secondary school settings and programs where students are placed and examine how that environment influences the triad's interaction."

Also at issue here is the character of the institutional milieu of the university setting in which a student teaching program is embedded. Clark and Marker (1975, pp. 58-59), for example, argue that variation among institutions of higher education is a significant factor in

influencing what and how students learn in teacher education programs.

> Given the range of institutional settings, it is simply not reasonable to argue that one finds a common teacher education program wherever one looks. Institutional climates vary markedly and these variances affect the nature of the student population, the expectations held for student productivity, the background and activities of the faculty, and the availability of physical and cultural resources. Such variances are not to be dismissed lightly. They affect all aspects of the relationship between the institution and its students, including the professional preparation of students in teacher training. Thus the critical variance in teacher education programs among institutions is perhaps more a function of overall variance by institutional types than by systematic variance attributable to the professional training itself. . . Similarity in course structure does not mean identical content of instruction within courses.

In Zeichner's (1985 b) examination of 16 representative studies of the role of student teaching in teacher development we find a variety of ways in which placement sites have been described. None of the studies describe the characteristics of the universities in which the programs were conceived. At the level of the classroom, 11 of the 16 studies do not provide any information at all about the character of the classrooms in which students worked beyond an occasional reference to the range of grade levels within a sample. On the other hand, two of the studies do provide some, but still minimal, information about the characteristics of classroom placements (e.g., the nature of the reading and language arts curricula in classrooms compared to the emphases within methods courses).

Fairly comprehensive approaches to the analysis of placement site characteristics were provided in three of the studies. As part of a 3-year study of 58 student teachers who were observed for one full period per week during their 8- to 16-week student teaching experiences, Doyle (1977) mapped out the ecological characteristics of classrooms in

which students taught and provided descriptions of the strategies which students used (both successfully and unsuccessfully) in attempts to reduce the complexity of classroom demands. Doyle (1977) argues that the ecological characteristics of classrooms, together with the nature of specific activity structures, are major determinants in influencing the actions of student teachers.

Second, Becher and Ade (1982) utilized the "Placement Site Assessment Instrument" to analyze the relationships between three specific placement characteristics as judged by university supervisors (modeling of commonly accepted good teaching behaviors, quality of supervisory feedback, and opportunities for student teacher innovation), the student teacher's potential field performance abilities, and the quality of students' performances in several successive practica including student teaching. Finally, Corcoran (1982) describes the instructional management system that was part of the classroom in which one intern teacher worked and discusses how the complexity of this system was related to the intern's problems in assuming instructional responsibilities.

At the next level of analysis, researchers have repeatedly emphasized the importance of school level variables such as school climate and certain kinds of norms among faculty in influencing the effectiveness of a school in accomplishing its goals, and its receptivity toward and capacity for school improvement and staff development (Good & Brophy, 1985; Little, 1984). It is reasonable to assume that these same kinds of school level factors will also affect the process of learning to teach during student teaching. In fact, several of the recent education reports (e.g., Goodlad, 1984) have

suggested that we begin to think of settings for student teaching and other field-based experiences in terms of the opportunities for learning about teaching which are offered by schools rather than by individual classrooms.

In Zeichner's (1985 b) examination of the 16 representative studies of student teaching we find only limited attention given to school level variables and to characteristics of the communities in which schools are located. Only two of the 16 studies give any attention to the influence of school level factors on student teacher development, and both of these studies (Hoy & Rees, 1977; Holt & Peterson, 1981) make assumptions about the character of schools (e.g., their bureaucratic nature) but fail to directly examine the actual nature of school characteristics in particular cases. Furthermore, the only study among the 16 that provides any description at all of the nature of the communities in which student teaching sites were located (Smith & Smith, 1979), provides very limited information about the socioeconomic status of pupils in various schools, but fails to describe the nature of the schools themselves.

If this group of 16 studies is in fact representative of recent studies in this area, then it appears that researchers have not paid much attention to the potential impact of particular types of classrooms, schools, and communities on the relationship between student teaching and teacher development. The conceptual and methodological approaches illustrated in the works of Doyle (1977), Becher and Ade (1982), Becher (1983), and Corcoran (1982), as well as the analyses of the dimensions of clinical settings provided by McIntosh (1968), Stevens & Smith (1978), and by Gallagher (1979), provide good examples of what

needs to be incorporated into studies of student teaching's role in learning to teach at the classroom level of analysis.

For example, Becher and Ade's (1982) "Placement Site Assessment Instrument," Stevens and Smith's (1978) "Supervising Teaching Evaluation Instrument," and McIntosh's (1968) set of dimensions for distinguishing among placement sites all provide good places to begin thinking about the most useful ways to assess the character and quality of the classrooms in which student teachers work. Alternatively, it is possible to employ a more ethnographic approach, as is exemplified in the work of Doyle, to map out the salient characteristics of classroom settings for student teaching. Whatever approach is taken by researchers, it is clear that studies which seek to understand the role of student teaching in teacher development need to place more emphasis on the specific constraints and opportunities which are present in specific classrooms.

At the school level of analysis, researchers on student teaching could begin to utilize concepts, methodologies, and insights evident in the contemporary literature on staff development and school effectiveness so that we can begin to understand how the character of a school, including its attention to the problem of "creeping exclusivity" (Little, 1984), affects the quality of classrooms as settings for student teaching and the processes of learning to teach within classrooms.

Finally, another aspect of the contexts of student teaching which has received little attention to date is the frequency, kind, and quality of supervision which student teachers receive. Although there have been numerous studies of the effects of specific forms of

supervisory feedback to student teachers under conditions (see Peck & Tucker, 1973) related to the purposes of research, there has been relatively little analysis of the substance and quality of supervision under normal conditions of everyday practice (Blumberg, 1980). Obviously it is not reasonable to treat student teacher supervision as if it was a homogeneous activity (Stones, 1984). Supervisors differ in the perspectives that they hold toward their work (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1982), and the substance and quality of supervisory conferences also varies greatly even within a single program (Zeichner & Liston, in press). More attention needs to be given in the future in studies of student teaching to the substance and quality of supervision as it actually exists under normal conditions of everyday practice if we want to understand how the contexts of student teaching influence teacher development.

Conclusion

It has been argued in this paper that the experience of student teaching entails a complex set of interactions among program features, settings, and people (the ecology of student teaching), and that research which seeks to understand student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach must reflect in its conceptualization and methodology the dynamic and multidimensional nature of the event being studied. The focus here has been on the inappropriateness of viewing student teaching as an undifferentiated entity unrelated to program content and to the contextual features of classrooms, schools, universities, and

communities. Other problems in the extant research related to the lack of attention to the characteristics and capabilities of specific individuals and to the definition of developmental outcomes (e.g., the lack of attention to unanticipated outcomes) has not been addressed in this paper. The position has been taken here that the current unsatisfactory status of the knowledge base in this area is closely related to the dominant tendency of ignoring program content and contexts in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. It is felt that we will only begin to move closer to understanding the role of student teaching in teacher development when we begin to take more of the ecological reality of student teaching into account in our research.

At this point in our development as a field there is little, if any, disagreement at a general level as to the importance of providing a quality student teaching experience in preservice teacher education programs. Although the appropriate question at this stage is not whether to offer such an experience or not, there has generally been little attention given by both researchers and practitioners to issues related to the actual substance of student teaching programs. Given the undeniable evidence that student teaching by itself is not necessarily a beneficial component in the education of teachers (Lanier & Little, 1985; Feiman-Nemser, 1983), we must be necessarily concerned with developing conceptual and curricular frameworks for student teaching and with discovering which particular kinds of programs, which individual components within programs, and which contextual dimensions of programs will help us more closely realize our particular goals for teacher development. Further discussion and debate over which particular goals for teacher development are most worthy of pursuit is also needed.

The question off the impact of student teaching on the process of learning to teach must be recast in the future to one where attempts are made to link specific dimensions of programs and specific types of programs, together with various contextual factors of programs, to socialization outcomes. The current practice of attempting to explain the role of student teaching in general in the process of learning to teach has not been very productive to date, nor is it likely to become more so in the future. All of the contemporary explanations of the socializing role of student teaching probably have some validity in some situations and for some students. The challenge that lies ahead is to understand more about student teacher socialization in different contexts and for different students.

Finally, it will obviously be very difficult to conduct the kinds of content and context sensitive studies which are viewed here as essential for enriching our understanding of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. It is not accidental that many of the studies which have been most informative about these issues have been funded through external sources (e.g., Connor & Smith, 1967; Griffin et al., 1983; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985). Koehler's (1985) characterization of teacher education research as "bootstrap research," the typically low levels of financial support for research on learning to teach, and the generally heavy teaching loads of those who are most interested in understanding student teaching all have made it somewhat difficult to conduct such studies. There are, however, examples of ecologically sensitive studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach which have not been supported by large external grants (e.g., Gaskell, 1975; Corcoran, 1982). Thus, although the lack of

financial support for studies of student teaching has been one obstacle to the accumulation of ecologically sensitive findings, there are many possibilities for conducting such research which have demonstrated that money is not an unsurmountable obstacle nor the only obstacle. The present paper has attempted to identify a few of these possibilities.

References

Becher, R. M. (1983, April). Field placement characteristics' relationship to clinical experience performance ratings of elementary and early childhood students. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Becher, R. M., & Ade, W. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 24-30.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. Educational Researcher, 5, 5-15.

Clark, D., & Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Combs, A. (1972). Some basic concepts for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 286-290.

Connor, W., & Smith, L. (1967). Analysis of patterns of student teaching. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Project No. 5-8204.

Copeland, W. (1981). Clinical experiences in the education of teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 7(1), 3-16.

Corcoran, E. (1982). Classroom contexts as settings for learning to teach. Action in Teacher Education, 4, 52-55.

Davies, D., & Amershek, K. (1969). Student teaching. In R. Abel (Ed.), The encyclopedia of educational research. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation to theory and practice in education In The third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.

Doyle, W. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Doyle, W. (1985). Learning to teach: An emerging direction in research on preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 31-32.

Feiman, S. (1979). Technique and inquiry in teacher education: A curricular case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 9, 63-79.

Feiman, S. (1980). Growth and reflection as aims in teacher education. In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Student teaching and the transition to pedagogical thinking. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Flowers, J. et al. (1948). School and community laboratory experiences in teacher education. Oncota, NY: American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Fullan, M.,& Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 47, 335-397.

Fuller, F. (1972). Personalizing teacher education. Austin TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Gallagher, P. (1979). The context in which student teaching occurs and its effect on student teacher performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.

Gaskell, P. (1975). Patterns and changes in the perspectives of student teachers: A participant observation study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Glassberg, S., & Sprinthall, N. (1980). Student teaching: A developmental approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 30-38.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1985). School effects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd. edition). New York: Macmillan.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study of theoretical analysis. Interchange, 15(3), 9-25.

Griffin, G. et al. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hersh, R., Hull, R., & Leighton, M. (1982). Student teaching. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), The encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed.) New York: The Free Press.

Holt, L., & Peterson, K. (1981). University and public school cooperation for professional growth. Action in Teacher Education, 3, 65-75.

Hoy, W., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 23-26.

Iannaccone, L., & Button, W. (1964). Functions of student teaching: Attitude formation and initiation in elementary student teaching. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1026.

Koehler, V. (1985). Research on preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 23-30.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lanier, J. (1984). The future of teacher education: Two papers (Occasional Paper No. 79). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. W. (1985). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), The handbook for research on teaching (3rd. ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Little, J. W. (1984). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. Teachers College Record, 86(1), 84-102.

McIntosh, R. G. (1968, February). An approach to the analysis of clinical settings for teacher education. The third Florence B. Stratemayer lecture, presented at the annual meeting of American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago.

McIntyre, J. (1983). Field experiences in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Nerenz, A. (1980). The influence of student teachers on their cooperating teachers' teaching strategies and beliefs about teaching and student teaching in foreign language instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Parlett, M., & Hamilton, D. (1976). Evaluations as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovatory programs. In G. Glass (Ed.), Evaluation studies: Review annual, Vol. I. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Peck, R., & Tucker, J. (1973). Research on teacher education. In R. Travers (Ed.), The second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (1979). Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-60.

Rosenfeld, V. (1969). Possible influences of student teachers on their cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 20, 40-43.

Ryan, T. (1982). Field experiences in teacher education. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (5th edition). New York: The Free Press.

Salzillo, F., & Van Fleet, A. (1977). Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 27-31.

Smith, D. S., & Smith, W. (1979). Teaching the poor: Its effect on student teacher self-concept. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 45-49.

Stevens, J. T., & Smith, C. L. (1978, October). Supervising teacher accountability: Evaluation by the student teacher. Peabody Journal of Education, 64-74.

Stones, E. (1984). Supervision in teacher education. London: Methuen.

Stones, E., & Morris, S. (1972). Teaching practice: Problems and perspectives. London: Methuen.

Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Teacher education as a set of dynamic social events. In B. R. Tabachnick, T. Popkewitz, & B. Bszekely (Eds.), Studying teaching and learning: Trends in Soviet and American research. New York: Praeger.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 28-36.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Tom, A. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry teacher education. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association.

Yates, J., & Johnson, J. (1981). A national survey of student teaching programs: Innovations in student teaching programs. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K. (1985 a). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Volume II. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. (1985 b). The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experience in teacher development. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Volume III. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (in press). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. Teaching and Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1985, April). Theory and practice in the evolution of an inquiry-oriented student teaching program. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8, 34-54.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1985). Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 5(1), 1-25.

Zeichner, K., & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8, 95-117.

Zimpher, N., deVoss, G., & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 11-15.

Notes

[1]These studies represent all of the reports of individual research efforts with a focus on student teaching and teacher development that have appeared in the two major referred United States journals devoted primarily to teacher education: (1) Journal of Teacher Education (1976-1983); (2) Action in Teacher Education (1978-1983). It is felt that these 16 studies are representative of recently published work in this area and that they provide an accurate reading of the conceptual and methodological orientations in studies of student teaching.

[2]Three major approaches currently exist within the "personalistic" orientation. First, advocates of "personalized" teacher education assess psychological maturity according to a developmental model of teacher concerns formulated by Fuller (1972). On the other hand, advocates of "Deliberate Psychological Education" have applied cognitive developmental theories to the design of teacher education programs and assess psychological maturity on the basis of the characteristics of the more advanced stages of one or more cognitive developmental theories (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980). Finally, the advocates of "Humanistic Teacher Education" (Combs, 1972) have constructed goals for teacher education upon the principles of perceptual psychology and seek to develop the "self" of the teacher in a manner consistent with empirical findings related to the belief systems of effective helpers in a number of occupations.

[3]This orientation can also be linked to Tom's (1984) conception of the teacher as a "moral craftsperson."

Orientation to Teacher Education	Dominant Conception of the Teacher Role	Curriculum	Stance Toward the Existing Institutional Form and Social Context of Schooling
Behavioristic	Teacher as a skilled performer	Received (explicitly defined)	Certain
Traditional-Craft (apprenticeship)	Teacher as a skilled performer	Received (not explicitly defined)	Certain
Personalistic	Teacher as an effective person	Reflexive (focus on promoting psychological maturity)	Certain
Inquiry-Oriented	Teacher as a professional decision maker	Reflexive (focus on both teaching and inquiry, e.g., teaching decisions, curriculum development)	Certain or Problematic depending upon the scope of the arena of the problematic

Figure 1. A Typology for Defining the Content of Student Teaching Programs.

The international study association on teacher thinking

INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES ON THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER BELIEFS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIORS: CASE STUDIES OF TWO BEGINNING TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES

B. Robert Tachachnick
Kenneth M. Zeichner

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
225 North Mills Street
Madison, WI 53706

Paper presented at ISATT's 1985 Conference, May 28 - 31, 1985, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-84-0008). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

ABSTRACT

This paper utilizes data from a study of two beginning teachers in the United States and analyzes the strategies employed by the teachers to reduce contradictions between their expressed beliefs about teaching (in four specific areas) and their classroom behavior. The individual and contextual factors related to the choice of a particular strategy and to its eventual success or failure are discussed. One of the teachers sought to change her behavior to create a closer correspondence between belief and action, while the other teacher changed her beliefs to justify behaviors that were inconsistent with her expressed beliefs.

THE PROBLEM

This report of research examines consistency and contradiction in teacher beliefs.

This paper will draw upon the data from a two-year longitudinal study of four beginning teachers in the United States (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1985; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985) and will analyze: (1) patterns of relationship between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors; (2) strategies employed by teachers in an attempt to bring about greater consistency between beliefs and behaviors; (3) the individual and contextual factors that influenced the relationships between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors.

In that two-year study, we aimed to explore the range of diversity of individuals' responses to the student teaching semester and, following that, to the first year of teaching. Our point of emphasis was to discover what perspectives toward teaching were developed by individual students during student teaching and how these perspectives were influenced by the interplay of the intentions and capabilities of individuals with the characteristics of the institutions of which they became a part, first as student teachers and later as teachers. The paper will be limited to an analysis of the relationships between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors during the second phase of our study--the study of the first year of teaching.

The construct of perspectives has its theoretical roots in the work of G. H. Mead and his concept of the "act" (Mead, 1983). Teaching perspectives were defined in our study as "a coordinated set of ideas and actions which a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation." This view of perspective is derived from Becker et al. (1961). According to this view, perspectives differ from attitudes since they include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, unlike values, perspectives are defined in relation to specific situations and do not necessarily represent general beliefs or teaching ideologies.

Teaching perspectives were defined in relation to four specific domains: (1) knowledge and curriculum, (2) the teacher's role; (3) teacher-pupil relationships, and (4) student diversity. Each of these four categories was further defined in terms of several specific dilemmas of teaching which had emerged in the analysis of our data from the study of student teaching (e.g., public knowledge vs. personal knowledge; knowledge as product vs. knowledge as process). Altogether 18 dilemmas of teaching were identified within the four categories of perspectives, and it was these dilemmas that gave direction to our data collection efforts during the second phase of our study.

A key assumption underlying the use of teaching perspectives as the organizing construct for our study is that teacher behavior and thought are inseparable and part of the same event. We assume that the meaning of teacher thinking cannot be understood in the absence of analyses of behavior engaged in by the actors to complete the ideas, to "express" them. Thinking and beliefs are, of course, not directly observable. We assume that classroom behavior expresses teacher beliefs in a way

similar to the use of language to answer the question, "What are you thinking?" or "What were you thinking when you did that?" It may be that classroom behavior is a way of thinking about teaching analogous to the craftsperson or artist who "thinks with his (or her) hands." The interest here moves beyond a concern with either teacher thinking or teacher behavior alone to a concern for the ways in which teacher behaviors represent active expressions of thought and the ways in which teacher behaviors represent apparent contradictions of expressed beliefs. We are interested in knowing if teacher behavior and beliefs move toward some kind of internal consistency over time. What appear to be contradictions between behavior and belief are often revealed as more consistent, from the teacher's point of view, when behavior is thought about as a statement of belief.

We utilize the data from our earlier study to probe instances of contradiction and consistency between what teachers say they believed (e.g., about the role of teacher, knowledge and curriculum, etc.), their expressions of intent for particular classroom activities, and their beliefs as expressed in their classroom behavior. After identifying the strategies employed by the two teachers in an attempt to bring about greater consistency between belief and action, we discuss the various individual and contextual factors in each case that influenced the relationships between teacher beliefs and behaviors.

Much of the research that has been conducted to date on the relationships between teacher beliefs and classroom behavior has established that there are fairly close relationships between teacher thought and behaviors (e.g., see Shavelson & Stern, 1981). However, (1) most studies have relied almost exclusively on teacher self-reports of their behaviors and not on analyses of observed teaching; (2) few studies have explicated the processes by which behaviors and/or beliefs are modified by teachers in an attempt to move toward greater internal consistency. The paper addresses both of these issues.

METHODOLOGY

The subjects for this study are two female first-year teachers who were employed in different school districts in the United States during the 1981-82 academic year. These individuals were selected from a representative group of 13 individuals who had been studied intensively during their student teaching experience at a large midwestern university the previous spring (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1985). Both of the teachers taught at the eighth-grade level.

Between August, 1981, and June, 1982, we spent three one-week periods observing and interviewing each teacher. A specific research plan was followed during each of the three weeks of data collection. During four days of each week an observer constructed narrative descriptions of events in each classroom using the four categories of perspectives and related dilemmas as an orienting framework. Each teacher was interviewed several times each day regarding her plans for instruction (e.g., purposes and rationales for particular activities) and her reactions to what had occurred. One day each week, an observer

constructed a narrative description of classroom events with a particular focus on six pupils in each classroom who had been selected to represent the range of student diversity in each classroom.

In addition to the daily interviews with each teacher that focused on particular events that had been observed, a minimum of two in-depth interviews were conducted with each teacher during each of the three data collection periods. These interviews sought to explore teachers' views regarding their own professional development in relation to the four orienting categories of perspectives and also addressed additional dimensions of perspectives unique to each teacher that had emerged during the year.

Additionally, we sought to investigate the influence of several institutional elements of school life on the development of teacher perspectives (e.g., school ethos and tradition, teacher culture, administrative expectations about the teacher's role). During each of the in-depth interviews we also asked the teachers about their perceptions of the constraints and encouragements that existed in their schools and about how they learned what was and was not appropriate behavior for teachers in their schools. We also interviewed each principal at least once and interviewed two other teachers in each school concerning their views of the degree to which each beginning teacher was free to employ independent judgment in her work. Finally, we also collected many kinds of formal documents in each school, such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks.

Through the classroom observations and teacher and administrator interviews we sought to monitor the continuing development of teaching perspectives and to construct in-depth portraits of life in each of the classrooms. Tape recorded interviews and classroom observations were transcribed to facilitate a content analysis of the data. Several analyses of these data led to the construction of case studies that describe the development of each teacher and the individual and social influences on their development from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching. The paper will draw upon the induction year portions of these case studies to examine the relationships between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors.

BETH: THINKING ABOUT TEACHING IN A CLOSELY CONTROLLED SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Beth was a student teacher in a middle-sized city (about 200,000) in a self-contained fifth-grade classroom, in an elementary school with grades kindergarten to fifth grade. In that community, this meant that her cooperating teacher was responsible for instruction in all subjects except art, music, and physical education. The prevailing style of teaching in her classroom was characterized by warm personal relationships, and some judicious sharing of curriculum decisions with pupils. Though most of the teaching was fairly routine (reading to answer questions about the text, drill in arithmetic), there was a genuine effort to encourage pupils' creative thinking and problem solving. Beth was encouraged to invent activities that would further these more

diffuse goals as well as to further routine classroom learning activities with more precisely targeted goals. Students were from a mixed socioeconomic background, mostly middle class, but some from economically poorer homes. The principal supported an "active" curriculum which challenged and displayed the results of pupils' creative efforts. The teachers and principal believed that they had firm community and parent support for such an approach.

As a first-year teacher Beth taught eighth graders in a middle school enrolling pupils in grades six through eight. The school served a middle-class community suburb to a moderately large city. Very few homes could be characterized as near poverty level. The school's organization was quite different from Beth's school during her previous (student teaching) year. Groups of 75 to 100 children were taught all the subjects by teams of three or four teachers. Art, music, and physical education were taught by specialists, and other specialists were available for advice on teaching reading and language and for help in working with poorly achieving or psychologically disturbed children.

Beth and her two co-teachers together taught approximately 80 pupils. Their teaching was directed by lists of "Performances" in each subject. The curriculum was referred to by the teachers and the principal as Performance Based Education (PBE) with pupil achievement being judged on the basis of Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT's). The lists of performances and the CRT's had been developed some years before by committees of teachers. Bureaucratic difficulty discouraged teachers from changing or adding topics. A CRT identified student inabilities, mainly in reading, language, and mathematics skills and in social studies and science information. Beth and her colleagues decided which of the teachers would be responsible for different groups of students in each subject, for the timing of instruction, and the scheduling of tests. Deviation from these time plans was discouraged. For example, taking longer to explore a topic or "going off on a tangent" (adding topics not specified in the PBE lists) might force one's colleagues to wait and waste time, since all pupils had to be tested at the same time. The school was built to an architecturally open plan so teachers could easily keep track of what was happening in other areas of the "pod." The principal frequently walked around the school and did not hesitate to discipline students or to point out to teachers deviations from established school procedures, either on the spot or in a later conference.

At the beginning of her first year as a regular teacher, Beth refers appreciatively to her student teaching when, from time to time, she decided on a topic to be taught, researched its content, and invented teaching strategies. Beth says she believes an "open and easy" approach to teaching is valuable because it stimulates pupils to think. In some interview statements she refers to the routine, or at least "follow-the-preset-pattern" nature of her teaching. In other statements she says she selects some of the topics for study, aims at stimulating pupils to "sit down and think about things," tries to think of ways to present the content that will capture the interest of pupils. However, she is observed to teach in a very controlled style. Her planning at the beginning of the year is almost entirely limited to deciding which

textbook pages to use in working with groups of 10 to 25 pupils; which and how many math solutions to demonstrate, whether to repeat teaching on a topic or go on to the next item on the PBE list. (Beth is under considerable strain at first, finding her way into the system. This is noticed by the principal who tries to get her to relax, boosts her self-confidence).

One instance is recorded, in five consecutive days of observation, of the "open and easy" style of teaching; the most capable math group is encouraged to find alternative solutions to problems. The pupils respond eagerly and Beth smiles and says to the observer, "I love this!" But the bulk of her teaching behavior follows from (1) earlier decisions about how many questions to ask or problems to explain; (2) on-the-spot reactions to time remaining, to student actions (redirecting misbehavior, answering questions, correcting errors with on-the-spot explanations); and (3) the existence of available materials (booklets, film strips) with previously developed worksheets or test questions. Post-teaching behavior is mainly correcting tests and selecting the next day's questions, worksheets, drill practice.

At mid-year, five days of observation reveal no equivalent to the exciting math lesson. All the observed teaching is guided by getting through the PBE lists of objectives. Beth says the main influences on what happens in her classroom are:

> . . . the school curriculum in that they say what should be taught . . . us pod teachers in deciding who teaches what . . . and then me, myself as a teacher, as in how I'm going to teach it.

Selecting or identifying goals is <u>not</u> an important effort. She says her goals:

> . . . [are] real sketchy . . . I really don't have any big ones set out . . . I'd like them to understand what I'm talking about, sure . . . and to retain some of the things that I've taught, definitely. But that would be it for goals.

Beth says she is satisfied with the amount of freedom she has to control what happens in her class, "It sets out things you should be doing, which is nice," she says, "because you know what's expected." She comments that she can generally teach the kind of curriculum that she thinks is important, "as long as it includes what has been set out for me to teach."

At the same time, Beth says she thinks her talents are underutilized. She says,

> School isn't just the place for basic learning, you know; the teacher talks and you learn or absorb it. [It should be] more of an interesting kind of place . . . but it's just not coming through anymore. I guess I just don't take the time to sit down and think about it like I used

to. Or I don't have the time to design some of the things that I designed that were really neat.

Asked about prep time, Beth says she has enough. She is observed in one class asking questions about a story in the reader that she had not read herself, though it was assigned to the children to read. At another time she is observed teaching the brightest math group:

Beth: Since we have time today we're going to go through these [tests] because (pause) . . .
Boy: There's nothing else to do.
Beth: Right (laughing).

Interviewed, Beth recalls that she knew the group wanted to know their scores and she didn't feel like correcting the papers at night, so she decided to make the next day's lesson consist of correcting the tests.

At the end of the school year, Beth's teaching is observed to have changed little from the mid-year description, except that she is more self-confident and practiced in implementing the PBE curriculum. With the end-of-year tests to face, all of her classroom behavior is focused on getting her pupils to perform well. Observations describe days filled with assigning drill and practice, giving information, and testing recall.

Beth's statements about her thinking during planning, during teaching, following teaching, have changed in that they no longer contain references to selecting topics, aiming to stimulate pupil creative thinking and pupil reflection, as had appeared in earlier statements of that type. She begins with the PBE lists of objectives, uses materials for which there are information and recall exercises (reading, social studies, science) or decides which and how many math solutions to present, choosing items from the textbook to illustrate. Decisions are often made on the spot regarding what to say about a math problem or what questions to ask, for example, about a story or a section of a science booklet. Consideration for team decisions about time schedules are the strongest determinant for whether to extend or abbreviate teaching, give more time to slower learners or not.

What has also changed are Beth's statements about her perspectives toward teaching and about what she thinks she <u>should</u> be doing. Her earlier statements of belief placed high value on planning for active ("hands on") learning by pupils, with teacher research into content in order to invent activities that will challenge pupil thinking and stimulate pupil interest. Her statements of belief now indicate that she has learned that she can be successful as a teacher without doing much detailed planning and without the need to do much (or any) research on the topics she intends to teach. Presumably, she finds enough in the Teachers Guides and the pupil materials to support the explanations and presentations she gives.

Beth's thinking about teacher classroom behavior has also changed in that she no longer sees much value in open discussions and "hands on" pupil activities. She intends to move more quickly the following year,

to spend less time explaining the work, leaving out discussions of topics which are not "on the test" and "covering more areas," especially areas that are tested.

HANNAH: THINKING ABOUT TEACHING IN A LOOSELY MANAGED SCHOOL

Hannah was a student teacher in a small village located near a middle-sized city (about 200,000) and worked as part of one of two fifth/sixth-grade teams in a grade 4-6 middle school enrolling about 500 children. There were four teaching teams in this school, each one of which was responsible for the instruction of approximately 120 children in all subject areas except art, music, and physical education. Hannah worked on a team with four certified teachers and had her own classes of around 30 pupils for each subject. During a typical week she taught almost all of the 120 pupils on her team, since the instructional program was totally departmentalized. The school community included few minorities and had a mix of parents ranging from a few who were very poor to some who were highly paid professionals. The majority of the parents were moderately well off financially.

Hannah was expected to follow very closely the highly structured curriculum of the school in all subject areas. She was provided with lists of specific objectives in each subject which she was expected to cover and with all of the materials and tests that she was expected to use. She was also expected to cover this curriculum within specified blocks of time and had very little choice about when subjects would be taught and for how long. Because of the open architectural design of the school where no walls separated the classrooms, all of Hannah's activities were totally visible to the other members of her team. She was told that very little noise and pupil movement would be tolerated so that the classes would not disturb one another. Hannah was generally provided by her colleagues with models of very formal and distant pupil-teacher relations.

Throughout the semester Hannah questioned the departmentalized school structure, the rationalized curricular form, and the distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils which were a part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school and felt she was being asked to fit into a teacher role that she did not like. Despite isolated efforts, which continued throughout the semester, to implement what she felt was a more varied and lively curriculum and to relate to her pupils in a more personal way than was common in her school, Hannah for the most part outwardly complied with the accepted practices in her school and did not act in a manner consistent with her expressed beliefs. At the end of the semester, despite the lack of confirmation from her experience as a student teacher, Hannah was more convinced than ever ("having learned a lot of things of what not to do") that warm and close relations between pupils and teachers, getting kids excited about learning and feeling good about themselves as people (e.g., by integrating their personal knowledge into the curriculum) were the keys to good teaching.

Hannah's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only eighth-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 public school enrolling about 190 pupils. The school was located in a rural farm community a few miles outside of a small city with a population of 9,000. Hannah taught all subjects except civics to her eighth-grade class and also taught science to the seventh-grade class. The parents of the children in her class were very diverse socioeconomically, ranging from those who were farm owners and professionals to those who were farm workers. All of the teachers lived in the immediate area with the exception of Hannah and one other teacher who commuted from a city 45 minutes away. Hannah was the youngest and the only first-year teacher in the school and the only one who had not completed a teacher education program at one of the relatively small state teacher's colleges which were now part of the state university system.

The culture, tradition, and organization of this school was quite different from the school in which Hannah completed her student teaching. On the one hand there was a very strong tradition of individualism in the school which sanctioned each teacher's right to do things in his or her own way, and there was very little cooperation or coordination among the staff. All of the classrooms with the exception of Hannah's and the seventh-grade class were totally self-contained, and each teacher was responsible for all of the instruction for a group of around 25 students. The principal of the school was also a full-time teacher and did not observe or confer with teachers except during weekly staff meetings.

Consistent with the individualistic tradition of the school, very few overt controls were exerted on teachers with respect to the planning and teaching of the curriculum. Teachers were given curriculum guides and textbooks for each subject area and were permitted to cover the content specified in the guides in whatever order, at whatever pace, and with whatever methods they thought were most appropriate. Teachers were also free to supplement the texts with any other materials and to go beyond what was listed in the curriculum guides as long as the curriculum was covered by the end of the year.

The only explicit controls which were placed on teachers' handling of the curriculum were in the areas of grading and testing. All of the teachers were expected to give each child 30 "marks" for each subject during each of three report periods and to grade pupils' work according to a standard grading scale. A great deal of emphasis was also placed upon pupil performance on a national standardized test given each spring.

Alongside the tradition of individualism in the school, there was also a very strong and mostly unspoken agreement among all but Hannah and one colleague in the seventh-grade class about the ways in which teachers should relate to their pupils. This approach was characterized by one teacher as "the old school method . . . you can't have someone here who is too soft with the kids." Hannah became aware of this consensus on teacher-pupil relations ("In this school it's the teacher's role to be the disciplinarian.") through observations of other teachers, through her pupils' comments, and indirectly through the school

"grapevine." Other teachers would rarely confront Hannah directly with criticisms of her more informal style of relating to pupils. On several occasions, however, teachers complained to the principal, who in turn passed the word to Hannah that she had violated the preferred formality between teachers and pupils. All of the classrooms with the exception of the seventh and eighth grades were very tightly controlled by teachers, and this strong, informal agreement among the staff initially made Hannah feel isolated and alone.

> You begin to try new things; everything is not out of the textbooks or worksheet oriented. They look down on that. But they don't constrain you and say you can't do things. They would never say you can't do things. They'll do it in a roundabout way . . . when it comes back to you, you feel that everyone else is against you.

The community was characterized by Hannah and several other teachers as extremely conservative, suspicious of new ideas, and as holding expectations for teachers to maintain very tight controls over pupils. Hannah initially felt more pressure from the parents than from her colleagues to conform to the unspoken tradition regarding the teacher's role and was initially reluctant to act on her intuitions because she felt that she was perceived as an outsider. From the beginning of the year, Hannah made many efforts to win the trust and confidence of the parents and to learn more about the ways and mores of the community.

At the beginning of the year, despite the lack of close supervision and formal controls, Hannah relied heavily on the textbooks in planning her curriculum; however, she also made efforts from the very beginning to establish warm and close relationships with her pupils in violation of the school's tradition. Hannah continued to describe her basic orientation to teaching as "humanistic" and emphasized the affective and interpersonal dimensions of her work. She felt strongly that a positive self-concept is the key to learning and wanted to find ways to make school enjoyable for herself and her pupils. Hannah tried very hard to present herself to her pupils as a "human being" by openly admitting her mistakes, her ignorance with regard to content, and by freely sharing aspects of her personal life with her pupils. She also made many efforts to understand the personal lives of each child in her class and to gain her pupils' trust and confidence.

Initially, Hannah's pupils were very suspicious of her efforts to break down the conventional barriers between teachers and students, and there was a lack of support from her colleagues. Hannah became confused and uncertain in the fall about the direction she should take, and established several classroom practices and rules which violated her own vision of "humanistic" teaching. Despite these isolated instances where Hannah flirted with more conventional methods of controlling her pupils, for the most part she exerted relatively little direct control over pupil behaviors, and the pupils gradually began to respond to her efforts.

Despite her efforts to establish warm and personal relations with her pupils which were gradually becoming more and more successful,

Hannah was frustrated with her heavy reliance on textbooks and with her inability to establish a more varied and lively instructional program. While she was very sure of herself in dealing with children in interpersonal matters, she felt that she did not have a clear idea of how to implement her expressed preference for a more integrated curriculum which incorporated children's personal experiences, which gave pupils concrete experiences in relation to ideas, and which elicited their enthusiasm and excitement about solving problems in relation to the world around them. "I just feel like I'm spoon feeding them and opening their heads and pushing the knowledge in."

Knowing that her pupils had been taught "right out of the textbook" in the past and that they would probably be taught so in the future, and not confident that she was able to explain to others how particular methods were meeting specific academic goals, Hannah worried a lot about handicapping her students and about not giving them what they were "supposed to learn." By December, Hannah was so frustrated that she considered quitting teaching and accepting another job outside of education.

As the year progressed, Hannah became more and more satisfied with her classroom program, and her actions began more and more to reflect her expressed beliefs about teaching. She continued to rely mainly on the texts in planning her lessons, but she gradually made more and more independent decisions which resulted in a greater emphasis on providing concrete experiences for children and on incorporating their personal lives into the curriculum.

By April, Hannah felt confident enough to drop the basal readers and to have her pupils read novels and to let two pupils teach a unit on engines to the class that drew upon their experiences in repairing farm vehicles. Throughout the year Hannah continued to expose all of her pupils to the same curricular content and stayed fairly close to the texts in some subjects (e.g., math), but her work in language, reading, and science reflected more and more of the active pupil involvement and problematic approach to knowledge that she had hoped to create since the beginning of her student teaching. By the end of the year Hannah felt that she had come closer to her ideal where pupils are thinking critically and constantly and where they are always asking questions and trying to apply their in-class learnings to everyday life.

There were several reasons why Hannah was able to move from a point in December where she considered quitting, to a feeling of satisfied accomplishment at the end of the year. Among these were: (1) the support she received from her one teacher ally, the seventh-grade teacher; (2) her ability to mobilize parent support for her classroom program; (3) the pupils' traditions of mutual peer support and the warm acceptance of Hannah as a "teacher-friend"; and (4) her pupils' success on the national standardized test (scoring the highest of all of the eighth grades in the district). Because of this support from the pupils, parents, and the seventh-grade teacher, and because of Hannah's determination, her skills in dealing with people, and her sensitivity to the political dimensions of schooling, she was able to significantly redefine aspects of her school in relation to her own class and to modify

her behavior to create more consistency between her beliefs and actions. Hannah maintained her beliefs regarding the importance of "humanistic" teaching throughout her student teaching and her first-year of teaching with little or no formal support from her schools and gradually, as her pupils and their parents began to respond positively to her approach, Hannah was able to find ways, by acting on her intuitions and through trial and error, of modifying her behavior to bring it into closer agreement with her beliefs about teaching.

CONCLUSION

Our conception of "perspectives toward teaching" is similar to what Clark and Peterson (in press) refer to as "teacher beliefs and implicit theories." There is some difference, since we treat classroom behavior as an expression of a teacher's beliefs or implicit theories about teaching and learning. The teachers we studied were also often able to articulate explicit theories of teaching; they often were aware of their beliefs and were ready to explain and justify them.

At the beginning of her first year as a teacher Beth made statements of belief about teaching that contradicted or were inconsistent with each other. Her teaching behavior was inconsistent with those statements of belief that referred to the need for active learning and creative problem solving. The teaching behavior was consistent with a belief in the value of a curriculum that encouraged pupils to learn prespecified information and skills. As the year passed, Beth's statements of belief contained fewer and fewer of the statements about the value of pupils' creative problem solving. Beth's beliefs changed until they were characterized by statements that affirmed and justified her teaching behavior; while her teaching behavior remains essentially the same throughout the year, it is more completely expressive of her statements of belief by the end of the school year.

Hannah also created closer agreement, as the year progressed, between her verbal and her behavioral "statements" of belief about teaching. She monitored her classroom behavior, modifying it to bring it into agreement with her beliefs about teaching. Her early lack of success led her to toy with the possibility of abandoning her beliefs (and abandoning teaching altogether), but by the end of the year she had reaffirmed her earlier commitments to an activity-oriented curriculum that encouraged pupil independence, initiative, and creative problem solving. At no time did her ideas or her behavior waver in revealing her belief that it was necessary to know children as people--and to be known by them as a person--in order to teach them successfully as pupils.

Both teachers reduced the inconsistencies in their statements of belief but used quite different strategies to do so. Partly, that was a result of their personal characteristics and history, their capabilities, their willingness to risk, their strength of commitment to a particular professional position. Hannah was both intuitively and consciously skilled in managing the political and social context of her classroom, her school, her school's community. She was also willing to make the effort. Beth avoided "political entanglements" and was content

to affirm principles of action which she seemed to reject early in the year, but whose affirmation created solidarity between her and her co-teachers and the principal.

The schools offered very different opportunities to exercise professional judgment. Edwards' (1979) analysis of methods of control of a workplace are helpful in recognizing differences in the two schools. Hannah's teaching principal had little opportunity to control teaching behavior. In addition, efforts at control would have violated that school's informal cultural norms of independence (at least for adults). Beth's principal was able and willing to exercise control over what happened in the school. Bureaucratic control through the social arrangement of teaching teams was powerful in Beth's school but weak in Hannah's school, in which teachers could operate more independently behind their closed classroom doors. Control by technical elements--the physical structure of an open architectural plan that made it easy to monitor teacher behavior, the specificity of a PBE curriculum--was present for Beth but absent for Hannah. Indeed. under the conditions of strict control that characterized her student teaching school, Hannah suppressed the expression of her ideas as behavior, while reaffirming them verbally. Edwards' theory of control does not account for the presence of the informal school cultures in both schools which either encouraged conformity or else encouraged independent teacher action.

Teacher thinking as described in our study was not merely the result of an individual's personal history and psychological state. Though apparently highly context specific, thinking was not merely shaped by the sociopolitical conditions in the school. Rather, we discovered that in both cases the move to greater consistency between belief and behavior was the result of a negotiated and interactive process between individuals and organizational constraints and encouragements.

REFERENCES

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Straus, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (in press). Research on teacher thinking. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed). New York: Macmillan.

Edwards, R. (1979). Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books.

Mead, G. H. (1938). The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shavelson, R. & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 51, 455-498.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1985). The teacher perspectives project: Final report. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11, 1-25.

SECTION V

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

THE WISCONSIN STUDY OF TEACHER SOCIALIZATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin at Madison

My paper will focus on the findings and implications of a two-year longitudinal study conducted under a grant from the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research and the National Institute of Education (Tabachnick, Zeichner, Densmore, & Hudak, 1983; Tabachnick & Zeichner, in press; Zeichner & Tabachnick, in press). This study of the development of teaching perspectives by four beginning teachers will be considered from two vantage points.

First, the study will be viewed as an inquiry aimed at illuminating important aspects of the process of learning to teach during the first year. The findings will be discussed in relation to the literature on teacher socialization and competing theories regarding (1) the degree of stability or instability in the development of teaching perspectives during the transition from student teacher to teacher (Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience?), (2) the key individual and social factors that influence the development of teaching perspectives, and (3) the role of individual intent and institutional constraint in the development of teaching perspectives (the degree to which first-year teachers are willing and able to employ independent judgment and personal discretion in their work). I will focus on how the findings of our study appear to confirm or challenge existing theories of beginning teacher socialization and the findings of specific studies, including our own earlier work at Wisconsin.

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

Second, the study will be considered as an examination of the first year of teaching within the context of the teacher induction literature. Findings will be summarized on the nature of supervision and staff development experienced by the four teachers. These findings will then be discussed in relation to the literature that has sought to document the status of induction-year assistance and assessment. The correspondence of the four teachers' induction experience with "induction" as described in the literature will be considered. I will also compare the experiences of the four teachers to the induction experiences that have been recommended in the literature for the last 20 years (e.g., reduced work load, opportunities for discussion with other beginning teachers, and opportunities to observe more experienced teachers) to determine whether recommended induction practices are evident in the experiences of these four teachers.

Methodology

During the first phase of our work, which began in the spring of 1981, we examined the teaching perspectives of 13 student teachers enrolled in an elementary teacher education program at a large midwestern state university, and we documented the development of teaching perspectives by these students during their 15-week student teaching experience.

Teaching perspectives have been defined by Becker (1964) as a "coordinated set of ideas and actions which a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation." According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes, because they include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, unlike values, perspectives are defined in relation to specific situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or teaching ideologies.

During this first phase of our work, we sought to identify through interviews and observations the teaching perspectives of the 13 student teachers in relation to four specific domains: knowledge and curriculum, the teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships, and student diversity, and to identify changes that took place in these perspectives during the semester. We also sought to identify various individual and social influences on the development of these perspectives.

During the next year (1981-82), we followed four of the original group of 13 students into their first year of teaching and asked two broad questions related to the general theme of teacher development:

1. How are the teacher perspectives evident at the end of student teaching strengthened or modified during the first year?
2. What individual and social factors influence the continuing development of teaching perspectives?

During this second phase of our work, we continued to use the four orienting categories of perspectives to describe teacher ideas and actions. Each of the four categories was further defined in terms of several specific dilemmas of teaching that had emerged from the analysis of the data in the first phase of the study (Table 1).

At regular intervals from September 1981 to May 1982, we spent three one-week periods with each of the four teachers. Using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods, we observed the classrooms of the four teachers and interviewed the teachers, their principals, and selected pupils and colleagues, in addition to collecting a variety of documents such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks.

The teachers, who were all women, worked in a variety of settings: one in an urban, one in a rural, and two in suburban schools. They were in schools that served very different kinds of communities--one school served children of upper middle-class professionals and corporate managers, and a second school served children of largely unemployed industrial workers. Three teachers worked in self-contained classroom settings with minimal departmentalization, and the fourth teacher worked in an architecturally open-plan school with complete departmentalization within teaching teams. Three were the only first-year teachers in their respective buildings, but one teacher had access to one other beginning teacher in her building. Two were the only teachers at their respective grade levels, and two teachers worked with other teachers who taught the same grade levels, or, in one case, the same pupils. Three of the four teachers taught at the seventh- or eighth-grade levels, and one teacher taught the fourth-grade (Table 2).

All of the teachers left the university with fairly similar teaching perspectives, according to our original typology. Three of the first-year teachers worked in settings whose institutional bias was not generally supportive of the teaching perspectives they brought with them. One teacher worked in a school whose institutional bias generally encouraged the continued development of her initial perspectives toward teaching.

Table 1

Eighteen Dilemmas of Teaching*

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Public knowledge--personal knowledge
2. Knowledge is product--knowledge is process
3. Knowledge is certain--knowledge is problematic
4. Learning is fragmented--learning is holistic
5. Learning is unrelated--learning is integrated
6. Learning is a collective activity--learning is an individual activity
7. Teacher control over pupil learning: high--low

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant--personal teacher-pupil relationships
9. Teacher control over pupil behavior: high--low

The Teacher's Role

10. The teacher's role is determining what to teach
11. The teacher's role is deciding how to teach: bureaucratic--functional--independent
12. The teacher's role in relation to school rules and regulations: bureaucratic--functional--independent

Student Diversity

13. Children as unique--children as members of a category
14. School curriculum: universalism--particularism
15. Student behavior: universalism--particularism
16. Allocation of school resources: equal--differential
17. Common culture--subgroup consciousness emphasis in school curriculum
18. Career orientation in relation to student diversity: little restriction--restricted

*The complete operational definitions for each of the 18 dilemmas are presented in Tabachnick, Zeichner, Adler, Densmore, and Egan (1982). Wherever possible, we used labels similar to those used by Berlak and Berlak (1981) in order to minimize the number of new labels and terms.

Table 2

The Four Teachers: Student Teaching and the First Year

	Student Teaching	The First Year
Hannah	4th-5th grade Total departmentalization within teams Suburban	8th grade Self-contained/minimal departmentalization Rural Only teacher at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Rachel	4th-5th grade Self-contained class Urban	7th grade Self-contained/minimal departmentalization Urban Only teacher at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Beth	5th grade Self-contained class Urban	8th grade Heavy departmentalization within teams Suburban One of nine teachers at her grade level Only first-year teacher in her school
Sarah	Junior primary (pre first grade) Self-contained class Suburban	4th grade Self-contained minimal departmentalization Suburban One of three teachers at her grade level One of three first-year teachers in her school

Findings--Phase I

At the end of the first phase of our study, we concluded that student teaching did not generally result in substantial changes in teaching perspectives. With the exception of 3 of the 13 student teachers who chose to comply strategically with the demands of their work settings, teaching perspectives solidified but did not change direction over the course of the semester. For the most part, students became more articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the perspectives that they had possessed in less developed form at the beginning of the semester (Tabachnick et al., 1983; Tabachnick & Zeichner, in press).

These findings generally support the position of Lortie (1975) and others who argue that student teaching plays little part in altering the cumulative effects of prior socialization. On the other hand, our findings appear to challenge those of Hoy and Reese (1977) and others who contend that student teaching exerts a powerful and homogenizing influence on student teachers' perspectives. Our findings also challenge Lortie's position, however, by depicting student teacher socialization as a more negotiated and interactive process than he theorizes it to be, one which entails more interplay between individuals and organizational constraints and encouragements.

These findings from the first phase of our study suggest several directions for research on student teacher socialization and for the conduct of student teaching programs. Our finding that student teachers for the most part are able to control the direction of their socialization and to develop more elaborate versions of the perspectives evident at the beginning of the semester is contrary to the conventional wisdom in the field and to the results of numerous studies (including some of our own earlier work) which have indicated that student teachers' attitudes and perspectives are significantly altered during student teaching.

As is the case with any research of this kind, findings related to the socialization of student teachers cannot be interpreted apart from consideration of the nature of the student teaching program that provides the context for an investigation. One cannot assume that all student teaching programs pose the same constraints and encouragements for students and that the socialization of student teachers takes the same form and has the same meaning in different institutions. The substance of particular student teaching programs (e.g., forms of supervision, expectations, and requirements for students), the characteristics of specific

placement sites, and the place of student teaching in the overall preservice program all necessarily affect the outcomes of student teacher socialization.

In the program that we studied, students had opportunities both before and after the beginning of the semester to give some direction to their experience. For example, students actively participated in the selection of their placement sites and, for the most part, placed themselves in situations that they felt would enable them to develop in desired directions. Also, field requirements for student teachers and specific expectations for their performance were largely negotiated among students, cooperating teachers, and supervisors. The university prescribed very few requirements that all student teachers were expected to fulfill and encouraged students to take active roles in determining the substance of their program. The university's stance toward program content as "reflexive" rather than "received" was consistent with students' active roles in the placement process and probably contributed to some extent to the continuity in the student teachers' development.

The nature of supervision in the program also encouraged students to clarify their perspectives toward teaching and, probably, to develop in a direction consistent with their entering perspectives. The weekly student teaching seminars with supervisors, the "inquiry-oriented" field assignments that students were required to complete, and the student teacher journals that were an essential part of the supervisory process were designed to encourage greater clarity about the substance of teaching perspectives, to promote a reflective or analytic stance toward teaching practice, and to push students to use personal discretion and independent judgment in their work. All of this suggests that under certain conditions it may be possible to help student teachers exert some control over their situations rather than being passively controlled by them.

The question of which specific dimensions of student teaching programs are related to particular socialization outcomes clearly needs further investigation. Our study underlines the inappropriateness of viewing student teaching experience as a unitary entity unrelated to specific program content and the contextual factors that exist in particular institutions. Future studies of the impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teaching perspectives should be designed to investigate the relationship of specific dimensions of programs and contextual factors to socialization outcomes.

It is not a question of whether Lortie's analysis is more accurate for student teachers and student teaching in general than the analyses of Hoy and

Reese or our own study. All of these explanations probably offer useful insights for some situations and some students. The challenge that lies ahead is to understand more about student teacher socialization in different contexts and for different students.

Findings--Phase II

For the most part, the literature on beginning teacher socialization has emphasized central tendencies of development in groups of beginning teachers while assuming school contexts to be relatively homogeneous and free of contradictory socialization pressures. This strategy tends to obscure important differences among teachers and among and within schools and is problematic, given the findings of our study.

The findings from the second phase of our study suggest that the continuing development of teacher perspectives during the formal transition from student teacher to teacher is much more varied and context-specific than is typically portrayed in the teacher socialization literature. No one explanation offered in the literature can account for the induction experiences of these four teachers, including (1) explanations of the degree of continuity or discontinuity in teacher development, (2) explanations of the key influences on beginning teacher development, and (3) explanations of the balance between individual intent and institutional constraint. The journeys of these four teachers from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching must necessarily be viewed in a manner that accounts for both the uniqueness and the commonality of their experiences.

Although these four teachers began their first year of teaching with fairly similar teaching perspectives, there were significant differences in the teachers' abilities and inclinations to implement their preferred perspectives and in the nature of the constraints and opportunities presented to teachers in each school. Despite the fact that three of the four teachers worked in very different situations as first-year teachers than as student teachers (different in the kinds of constraints, possibilities, school traditions, and cultures), only one of the four teachers conformed to the commonly accepted scenario and significantly changed her perspectives in a bureaucratic direction in response to the pressures of organizational demands. Two of the teachers maintained, with varying degrees of success, significant elements of their perspectives that were in conflict with the institutional biases in their schools. With the support and encouragement of

a few teachers in her school, the fourth teacher continued on a course of development that was already evident at the end of student teaching. Although this teacher saw herself as becoming less idealistic over the course of the year (e.g., having to follow the textbook more and feeling less in control of her classroom than as a student teacher), the essential characteristics of her initial perspectives were still evident at the end of the year and were strengthened and refined during the course of the year.

To analyze the data, we used an elaborated version of Colin Lacey's (1977) conceptual framework of social strategies to describe the nature of the interactions between the initial perspectives of the four teachers and the institutional constraints and encouragements in each school. I'll briefly summarize the experiences of the four teachers through the lens of "social strategy" to demonstrate one aspect of the varied nature of the socialization experiences of the four teachers.

Lacey challenges Becker's situational-adjustment notion that individuals are likely to turn themselves into the kind of person that the situation demands and proposes the construct of social strategy as a heuristic device for understanding the degree to which individuals are socialized into their roles. Lacey's ideas rest on the important distinction between socialization as value commitment and as behavioral conformity. He identifies three different social strategies:

1. Internalized adjustment. Individuals comply with an authority figure's definition of a situation and believe this conformity to be for the best. They willingly develop into the kind of person the situation demands, showing both behavioral conformity and value commitment. This strategy corresponds to Becker's notion of situation adjustment.

2. Strategic compliance. Individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation but retain private reservations about doing so. They do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs; their outward conformity is an adaptive response without the corresponding value commitment on which the behavior presumably rests.

3. Strategic redefinition. Individuals make successful attempts to change institutional constraints without the formal power to do so. They attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in the situation and to introduce new and creative elements into the social setting.

In our analysis we made two modifications of Lacey's original conceptual model. First, we modified the category of strategic redefinition to include unsuccessful as well as successful attempts to change institutional constraints. We also elaborated the original model to enable us to account for the two different institutional context experiences each teacher had by adding a

contextual factor to the definition of social strategy--similar or dissimilar context. This factor considers the overall similarity or dissimilarity between the two institutional contexts for each teacher and how supportive or unsupportive the institutional bias is at each stage of the expression of individual teacher perspectives.

Table 3 describes the dominant social strategy of each of the four teachers at each stage of their career. As can be seen from the table, two of the four first-year teachers (Hannah and Rachel) sought to redefine the boundaries of acceptable behavior in their situations. Hannah was successful in doing so, but Rachel was not. In both cases, the institutional bias in the school was not supportive of these efforts at strategic redefinition. The reasons why the attempts at strategic redefinition failed or succeeded include the degree to which teacher perspectives were developed at the beginning of the year, the strength with which they were held, the "coping skills" and political sensitivity of the teachers, the degree of contradiction between formal and informal school cultures, and the reactions of the pupils to the teachers (Tabachnick & Zeichner, in press).

The other two teachers (Beth and Sarah) adjusted to the dominant norms and values in their schools. Sarah, who was in a situation very similar to the school where she student taught, was able to continue developing the teaching perspectives she had held during student teaching. Beth, who taught in a school very different from the one that she had worked in as a student teacher, appeared to shift away from her entering perspectives toward perspectives more consistent with those encouraged by the dominant formal and informal cultures in her new school. This use of Lacey's framework for viewing the socialization of the four teachers demonstrates clearly the varied nature of teachers' induction into their roles.

A second interest in our study was to examine the nature of the institutional influences on the four teachers--how the teachers learned what was expected of them, how desired behaviors were reinforced, and how organizational sanctions were applied. Here, as in the case of individual teacher social strategies, we also found more variation than homogeneity. We used a modification of Richard Edwards' (1979) three forms of organizational control (direct, bureaucratic, and technical) to examine the formal control structures in each school. Edwards defines these three types of institutional control mechanisms in relation to three specific aspects of the work process:

Table 3

Dominant Social Strategies Employed by the Four Teachers During Student Teaching and the First Year

	Student Teachers	The First Year
Hannah	Strategic compliance	Successful strategic redefinition (dissimilar context)
Rachel	Internalized adjustment	Unsuccessful strategic redefinition (dissimilar context)
Beth	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment (dissimilar context)
Sarah	Internalized adjustment	Internalized adjustment (similar context)

1. The direction of work--the specification of what needs to be done, in what order, with what degree of precision, and in what period of time.

2. The evaluation of workers' performances--how work is supervised and the performance of workers assessed.

3. Discipline--how workers are sanctioned and rewarded in attempts to elicit cooperation and compliance with institutional norms.

With direct control, superordinates personally supervise the actions of workers and through close monitoring of workers' actions attempt to ensure that workers comply with organizational norms. With bureaucratic control, controls are embedded into the social structure of the work place and are enforced through impersonal rules and hierarchical social relations. With technical control, an organization's control over its members is embedded into the physical structure of the labor process, and jobs are designed in ways that minimize the need for personal supervision by administrators and the need to rely on workers' compliance with impersonal bureaucratic rules. As Sykes (1983) has pointed out, technical control over the processes and outcomes of instruction has commonly included the use of tests to ensure accountability, the development of teacher-proof curriculum materials, the creation of instructional management systems, management by objectives, and the like.

We found that there was generally very little direct and close supervision of the four teachers by their principals and other supervisors. Although all of the principals articulated expectations about what teachers were supposed to teach and how they should manage their classrooms, three principals made very little effort to ensure teacher compliance by direct classroom monitoring. This apparent neglect of the first-year teachers was typically a result of the principals' conscious decision to rely on experienced teachers to assume the responsibilities for inducting the new teachers:

> You rely upon your veteran teachers on your staff on the grade levels, because they've been here, they know where the materials are, they know the curriculum, and they are the ones that can give the best advice as to what things may have been tried and maybe weren't really productive in their classrooms. I lean very heavily on the veteran teachers on the grade level to assist the new teacher. If a new teacher still has lots of questions, she can find me.

As one would expect, numerous bureaucratic rules and regulations in each school attempted to dictate to varying degrees how and what to teach and how to manage pupil behavior in and out of the classroom. We found that bureaucratic rules such as those articulated in teacher handbooks gave the four teachers

varying degrees of information regarding performance expectations and the limits beyond which organizational sanctions would be applied. We also found, consistent with Weick's (1976) notion of schools as "loosely coupled systems" and with Bidwell's (1965) notion of "structural looseness," that the first-year teachers were able to ignore or to openly violate bureaucratic rules when they chose to do so. The self-contained classrooms in three of the four schools, together with the minimal amount of supervision by the principals, weakened to some extent the controlling effects of the bureaucratic organization.

In all the schools, the most pervasive and powerful type of control was technical control exerted through the timing of instruction, teacher work loads, the form of the curriculum and curriculum materials, and the architecture of the school. Technical control reached into each of the four teachers' classrooms. For one teacher in particular (Beth), the pace of instruction, the open architectural plan, precise time schedules, and the performance-based curriculum all made deviation from the preferred patterns of teaching very difficult.

Nevertheless, technical control was less complete than other forms of control, was not as strongly reinforced by other forms of control, and was more easily ignored or manipulated by teachers. Technical control did not constitute an irresistible pressure for teacher conformity. Even first-year teachers managed at times to avoid or to redirect elements of technical control when they chose to do so. The interests and abilities of each teacher, both professional and sociopolitical, largely determined which constraints would be accepted or resisted, which opportunities would be realized or allowed to lapse.

An example of loose coupling in the technical control of instruction is one teacher's disregard for the curriculum guides provided at the beginning of the year:

> I've been handed great big folders of objectives for every single course, but they're so full of philosophy it's hard to weed out the exact things for each unit as you're going on. I looked at them and decided that they were too much to bother with.

In the final analysis, the constraints and opportunities presented to each teacher were determined by the interaction between these three institutional control mechanisms and the interaction between these formal controls and the school ethos and tradition communicated to the beginning teachers through the informal teacher, pupil, school, and community cultures. In school settings, particular combinations of formal and informal factors were most salient (parents, performance-based curriculum, pupil responses, suggestions of experts, and high

work volume). The case studies describe the particular constellations of factors that interacted with the abilities and inclinations of the first-year teachers in each instance. There was much variation in the nature of the organizational pressures and the individual responses to these pressures.

I would like to examine briefly the experiences of the four teachers from the point of view of the literature on teacher induction. Defino and Hoffman (1984) state that "the once neglected lives of first-year teachers have in the course of just a few years become the focal point of considerable activity. State mandated induction programs are proliferating at a rate almost too rapid to monitor" (p. 23). Their survey of state-mandated induction programs indicates that 15 states have initiated activities related to induction programs within the last five years. Feistritzer's (1984) book, The Making of a Teacher, identifies activity in 25 states related to some form of supervised post-graduate internship experience.

The supervision and staff-development support experienced by the four teachers in our study was generally consistent with that described in the teacher induction literature prior to the recent flurry of activity. The teachers were provided with little or no formal staff development that gave explicit recognition to their special status as first-year teachers. As was mentioned previously, formal supervision and assessment of their work by principals and supervisors was minimal, and the little that did occur was not focused primarily on issues of curriculum and instruction:

> Mainly the only things he commented on...he didn't comment on terribly much. He said the introduction of the lesson went well and that I seemed very well organized. But that's all he said about the teaching aspect...Then he just commented that discipline was good and that I had respect for the children and children had respect for me. And I thought that it was kind of strange that he didn't go into the other things more...His whole emphasis is on how everything looks from the outside. Whether you accomplish anything, he never gets around to the point of it. It's just how it looks. (Sarah's comments about her only formal observation by her principal.)

Most of the support and assistance provided to these teachers was given informally by colleagues usually teaching at the same grade level. These informal attempts at influence were often contradictory in nature. They were limited by the structural constraints of the teachers' work rather than by the reluctance of experienced teachers to infringe on the professional autonomy of a neophyte, as some have suggested. As one teacher commented,

> During student teaching, there was always somebody there...giving you suggestions and praises and things, and here you are just in a little classroom. Nobody sees you all day long...I haven't received that much help

(from her two co-grade-level teachers)...It's mainly that there's no time to have apart, where you can share ideas and ways to teach things. There's just no time in the day to do that...There's no time set up specifically for it, and if you don't give a teacher specific time for it, they're going to use it for other things, 'cause there's so many other things they could be doing.

For at least the last 20 years, the induction literature has offered a series of very consistent recommendations for the improvement of the lives of first-year teachers. It has recommended such job-embedded supports as reduced work loads, extra released time, reduced class sizes, exemptions from nonteaching responsibilities, structured opportunities for discussions with other beginning teachers, and the opportunity to observe and be observed by experienced colleagues. There is almost no evidence of any of these job-embedded supports in the experiences of the four teachers in our study. The four teachers, as Lortie suggests, assumed full responsibility from the first working day and performed the same tasks as their more experienced colleagues. In addition to full instructional responsibilities, these teachers also assumed additional responsibilities, serving on curriculum committees, advising student councils, and coaching Pom-Pom and track. In one case, a teacher was hired partly because of her willingness to assume these extra noninstructional duties.

Implications for Policy and Practice

As a study of learning to teach and a study of induction, our work has several implications for policy and research in teacher education. From what I have said thus far about our findings, one would be left with both an optimistic and a pessimistic picture of the lives of beginning teachers. The optimistic picture would be in relation to the socialization questions that were addressed in our study. Our findings indicate that it is possible even for first-year teachers (given particular conditions both individual and social) to exploit openings created by weak and contradictory efforts at institutional control and to express elements of their preferred teaching perspectives even in the face of institutional pressures to do otherwise. The effects of university teacher education are not necessarily "washed out" by school experience, and beginning teachers do not necessarily abandon their ideals during their first year, as has been so often claimed.

The pessimistic picture would be in relation to the lack of assistance and support provided to these four teachers. None of the practices recommended in the literature for the last 20 years were evident in the experiences of these

teachers, and almost no formal provisions were made for their special status as first-year teachers. This lack of induction-specific support was the case despite all of the reasons, both logical and empirical, that have been offered in the literature in support of the need for such assistance (Zeichner, 1982).

There is more that needs to be said, however, about the allegedly optimistic picture our study paints of the resiliancy of individual teachers in the face of institutional pressures. Specifically, while our interactionist research approach has challenged functionalist accounts of teacher socialization that portray beginning teachers as passive recipients of institutional values (giving little or no direction to the quality and strength of their induction into teaching), what I have said thus far has not indicated the very narrow range within which individual/instructional negotiations took place.

Although each of the teachers, with the exception of Beth, was able to find some room to express elements of her teaching perspectives (for Sarah it was not a struggle), none of the teachers challenged the very limited teacher roles that they and their colleagues were confronted with. For the most part fundamental decisions about what would be taught and how (objectives, content, materials, pace of instruction) had been made by others removed from the classrooms of the four teachers and there were very little positive incentives or opportunities for the teachers to exercise independent judgment regarding goals for instruction, the design of learning activities, and the means for their evaluation. In fact, in many cases it was not even necessary for the teachers to bring knowledge of the content to be taught to the task.

Lanier and Little (1984) argue that

> Opportunities to exercise informed judgment, engage in thoughtful discourse, and participate in reflective decision making are practically nonexistent in teaching as presently defined. (p. 53)

Our data generally support this point of view (for both the four teachers and their experienced colleagues) despite the existence of individual/institutional negotiations and the varied individual response in terms of social strategies.

Significantly, in none of the four cases were the situations set up to encourage teachers (beginning or experienced) to participate in decisions and to exercise independent judgment about the core aspects of their work. Staff development initiatives and numerous bureaucratic and technical controls served to undermine teachers' sense of professionalism and implicitly communicated a message

which was very similar to Gary Sykes' (1983) characterization of the message sent to teachers by recent policies affecting teacher work:

> We don't trust you; we have little confidence in your competence; we are going to scrutinize you carefully and wherever possible constrain your discretionary behavior. (p. 92)

Beth was essentially satisfied with the limited autonomy that she was given over her work, but the others were less happy with the gap between their initial expectations for opportunities to exercise judgment and the realities of their workplace. Even Sarah, who was the teacher in a school that was very supportive of her preferred perspectives, came to characterize the work of teaching as "having to put up with people who don't think you know too much." Ryan (1982) argues that the first year of teaching is the teachable moment in the career of a teacher. What these four teachers were learning about the degree of occupational self-direction inherent in the teacher's role from observing those around them can only serve to undermine the extent to which the occupation can draw upon the resources and capabilities of these teachers in the long run.

There are at least two possible motives for seeking to gain a greater understanding of the factors related to the development of teaching perspectives. Specifically, greater knowledge about the development of teaching perspectives could be utilized either to enhance or to limit and control the expression of individual perspectives and the occupational self-direction and independent judgment exercised by teachers. It is our belief (in part supported by our data) that learning for both pupils and teachers is greater and deeper when teachers (individually and collectively) are permitted to exercise their judgment with regard to the content and processes of their work in their classrooms and to give direction to the shape of schools as educational environments. We believe it is counterproductive, although less risky, to attempt to control the actions of teachers more closely. We see the challenge offered by the findings of our study in pointing to the need for the creation of more democratic conditions in our schools that cultivate the educational leadership of teachers--conditions that assume that teachers can be adequate and that they are capable of participating along with administrators and parents in fundamental curricular and organizational decisions.

Griffin (1984) has identified two approaches in the recent flurry of induction-related activity--the assessment and assistance models. In the former, the induction program is a means to secure information regarding the competence

(according to certain criteria) in order to make decisions regarding retention or dismissal. In the latter, the induction program provides resources to new teachers in the belief that the resources will help them to improve their teaching.

Obviously there are many things that beginning teachers need to learn that preservice teacher education cannot teach them. Efforts to provide first-year teachers with the kinds of assistance lacking in our study and recommended in the literature should be strongly encouraged. In our view, however, we need to couple these efforts to ease the transition of beginning teachers with systematic efforts to reform the structures of teaching and workplace characteristics affecting all teachers. In our view, neither of the two current approaches to induction-year support address this central issue.

The lack of opportunities for teachers to exercise occupational self-direction is not new. Lanier and Little (1984) summarize a variety of empirical evidence that shows that a norm of intellectual dependence on external expertise was established for teaching in America in the late nineteenth century. Neither will the kinds of changes that we and others are proposing likely come easily or quickly. However, we are in agreement with Lee Shulman (1983) who has argued that talk of improvements in the teacher education process or of dramatic changes in the quality of those who opt for teaching seems pointless until we address the conditions that demean the dignity of the occupation itself. Teacher induction cannot and should not be discussed or addressed in isolation from this fundamental problem of the occupation.

I want to be clear that I'm not arguing against the kind of staged entry that is evident in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg career ladder plan (Schlechty, 1984). There should be, in my opinion, increasing responsibility given to teachers as they gain more experience and demonstrate their competence on instruction-related tasks.

I am also mindful of Judith Warren Little's warning expressed at a conference last July that we need to be careful not to be too easily seduced by collegial authority. Little (1984) raised two important questions regarding this issue: (1) Is the quality of solutions to problems better with increased collegial authority? (2) Is the holding power of the occupation improved? While there is some empirical evidence that increased collegial authority among teachers enchances teacher satisfaction and school effectiveness (Pratzner, 1984; Conway, 1984), the relationships involved are fairly complex. There is much that is now

proposed on the basis of faith and logic or on moral ground that remains to be documented empirically.

Little (1984) also made a particularly significant point in stating that a good environment for teaching (one with norms of collegiality, risk taking, and experimentation) is not necessarily the same as a good environment for learning how to teach. In her paper, Little described one of her exemplary schools where collegiality and the pace of innovation were high but where beginning teachers were frustrated because adjustments had not been made for the induction of new teachers into an already ongoing system. Beginning teachers clearly need more support than most now get and more support than most experienced teachers.

I do feel, however, that plans for induction programs, for higher standards in preservice teacher education, and so on need to occur along with a shift in the current balance between top-down executive authority (usually deficit oriented in its approach) and responsible collegial authority (responsible in that it is staged) where teachers are included in a more significant way in making the decisions that matter. I am willing to place my bets that "meeting the needs of our children" (Reagan, 1984) can be better met by putting our limited resources into making schools more educative places for teachers than into projects that implicitly devalue the teacher's work and limit the teacher's ability to exercise judgment. These top-down executive directives may minimize the effect of weak and lazy teachers but they will also probably minimize the effects of the many inspiring and hard-working teachers that are now in our schools.

Finally, we keep hearing that preservice teacher education, induction, and inservice are inseparable. In this context it is important to point out that interventions into the workplace of the teacher are in fact interventions into preservice education as well. Recent studies (Lanier & Little, 1984) indicate that over 70% of college of education faculty have K-12 teaching experience, the majority for three or more years. Thus, those of us who conduct preservice teacher education have been shaped in part by the same conditions under which most K-12 teachers now work. Unless the reform of preservice teacher education includes attention to the reform of school workplace conditions, efforts to reshape the character of our preservice programs are not likely to succeed.

Implications for Research

First, there is clearly a need for more longitudinal studies of beginning teacher socialization that go beyond a focus on central tendencies in teacher

development. While our study provided some information about the institutional-individual interactions that are related to the development of individual teaching perspectives, there is clearly much that remains to be done to clarify the particular factors, both individual and social, that affect the development of perspectives. It would be interesting, for example, to conduct socialization studies in Florida, Georgia, and Oklahoma to see if the process of learning to teach is altered where deliberate attempts have been made to alter the induction year.

Second, although our study examined influences on the development of teaching perspectives at both the classroom and school levels, we did not give much systematic attention to the socializing influence of factors outside of the schools and the university. Many studies have documented how social practices, policy initiatives, and forms of meaning and rationality in the society as a whole and in particular communities have affected the circumstances of teachers' work (cultural stereotypes of women, the bureaucratization of work). The linkages between these and other cultural factors and the development of individual teaching perspectives have not been well established. Much empirical work remains to be done to clarify the nature of the influence of cultural codes and the material and social conditions in the society and in particular communities on the development of perspectives by individual teachers.

Finally, Simon Veenman (1984), a Dutch teacher educator, has hypothesized in his recent review of the literature on beginning teachers that the "social strategies" discussed in our study and in the studies of Lacey (1977) may be connected with certain cognitive developmental stages identified by developmental psychologists. There is an important integration that needs to occur between the sociological orientation of our own and similar studies and the work of developmental psychologists who have recently directed their efforts to the study of teacher education.

References

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methune.

Bidwell, C. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Conway, J. (1984). The myth, mystery and mastery of participative decision making in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 11-40.

Defino, M., & Hoffman, J. (1984). A status report and content analysis of state-mandated teacher induction programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Edwards, R. (1979). Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books.

Feistritzer, E. (1984). The making of a teacher. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Griffin, G. (1984). Supervision and evaluation in student teaching, induction and inservice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hoy, W., & Reese, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 23-26.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. W. (1984). Research in teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Edition). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Little, J. W. (1984). Learning to teach in teacher education. Paper presented at the national invitational conference, "Learning to Teach: Acquiring the Knowledge Base of Classroom Practice." Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Pratzner, F. (1984). Quality of school life: Foundations for improvement. Educational Researcher, 13, 20-25.

Reagan, B. (1984). From boardrooms to blackboards: How can business and industry support technology in the public schools? Paper presented at the national invitational conference, "Policies, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education: Beyond the Looking Glass." Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Ryan, K. (1982). Why bother with teacher induction? In G. Hall (Ed.), Beginning teacher induction: Five dilemmas. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Schlechty, P. (1984). A framework for evaluating induction into teaching. Paper presented at the national invitational conference, "Policies, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education: Beyond the Looking Glass." Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Shulman, L. (1983). Autonomy and obligation: The remote control of teaching. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Sykes, G. (1983). Contradictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 87-93.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., & Hudak, G. (1983). The development of teacher perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (In press). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K. M., Adler, S., Densonore, K., & Egan, K. (1982). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54, 143-178.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Zeichner, K. (1982). Why bother with teacher induction? In G. Hall (Ed.), Beginning teacher induction: Five dilemmas. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), The first years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (In press). Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching.

SECTION VI

Appendices

APPENDIX A

The Teacher Belief Inventory

APPENDIX A

THE TEACHER BELIEF INVENTORY

Introduction

On the following pages there are a number of statements about teacher beliefs. Our purpose is to gather information regarding the attitudes of participants in our teacher education program. You will recognize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. We are only interested in your frank opinions.

Confidentiality

Your responses will remain absolutely confidential. No individual or school will be named in the report of the study. However, because we plan to select 12 students (from among those who volunteer) for more intensive interviews and observation, we ask you to write your student ID number at the top of the next page.

Student ID Number _____

THE TEACHER BELIEF INVENTORY

1. I plan to teach next year, 1981-82, the year following my certification (check one).

   Yes _____ No _____

2. In 10 years from now, I see myself (check one)

   a) as a classroom teacher _____

   b) working in education _____

   c) working outside of education _____

(Circle one for each question.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. The public schools as they now exist are generally doing a good job for most children.	1	2	3	4
4. A teacher should start the year as a strict disciplinarian and gradually become more approachable as his/her class comes to respect his/her authority.	1	2	3	4
5. Teachers should use the comparison of one child's work with that of another as a method of motivation.	1	2	3	4
6. Schools should emphasize the similarities among people rather than their differences.	1	2	3	4
7. Teachers should encourage parents to work with them inside the classroom.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. A teacher's political beliefs have no place in the classroom.	1	2	3	4
9. Deciding <u>how</u> to teach the curriculum is the major problem confronting teachers as opposed to deciding <u>what</u> to teach. What to teach is already known for the most part.	1	2	3	4
10. Generally it is a poor idea for students to sit on the floor during a lesson.	1	2	3	4
11. Multiple and diverse criteria should be employed by teachers to evaluate children. It is not fair to use the same criteria to evaluate all children.	1	2	3	4
12. Parents should participate in hiring teachers for their children's school.	1	2	3	4
13. It is as important for children to enjoy school as it is for them to acquire specific skills.	1	2	3	4
14. Teachers should feel free to depart from the school district's adopted curriculum when it seems appropriate to do so.	1	2	3	4
15. Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds cannot be expected to assume the same degree of responsibility for their learning as students from more economically advantaged backgrounds.	1	2	3	4
16. Instruction in the 3 R's should take up most of the school day. Other subject areas (e.g., Science, Social Studies) should be given less emphasis in the curriculum.	1	2	3	4
17. Schools should seek to help all children to fit as smoothly as possible into our present society.	1	2	3	4
18. Teachers should be involved in administrative decisions in their school (e.g., allocating their school's budget, hiring staff).	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. One of the main problems in a classroom today is diversity among pupils.	1	2	3	4
20. Parents and other community members should have the right to reject school books and materials.	1	2	3	4
21. Teachers should ignore school regulations when they feel that they interfere with the welfare of their students.	1	2	3	4
22. It is important for teachers to divide the school day into clearly designated times for the different subject areas.	1	2	3	4
23. No matter how hard they work, some students will never be able to make it in school.	1	2	3	4
24. Teachers should allow students to go to the bathroom at just about any time.	1	2	3	4
25. Teachers must lower their expectations regarding academic performance for those students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.	1	2	3	4
26. Parents have no right to tell teachers what to do in the classroom.	1	2	3	4
27. The knowledge of different subject areas should be taught separately because important knowledge is overlooked when subjects are integrated.	1	2	3	4
28. Teachers should be left free to determine the methods of instruction that they use in their classrooms.	1	2	3	4
29. Schools today pay too much attention to the social-emotional needs of children and not enough emphasis is given to academic skill development.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
30. Teachers should tell students a great deal about themselves.	1	2	3	4
31. The home backgrounds of many children are the major reasons why those children do not succeed in school.	1	2	3	4
32. A teacher's primary task is to carry out the educational goals and curricular decisions that have been formulated by others.	1	2	3	4
33. Parents should have the right to visit their child's classroom at any time given that the teacher is given prior notice.	1	2	3	4
34. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.	1	2	3	4
35. Teachers should design their own learning activities for children rather than relying on prepackaged materials.	1	2	3	4
36. Teachers should encourage students to speak spontaneously without necessarily raising their hands.	1	2	3	4
37. Schooling as it now exists helps perpetuate social and economic inequalities in our society.	1	2	3	4
38. Children should have some control over the order in which they complete classroom assignments.	1	2	3	4
39. Boys require closer control by the teacher than girls.	1	2	3	4
40. Teachers should not participate in local political activities when it involves criticism of local school authorities.	1	2	3	4
41. It is more important to teach children the 3 R's than the skills of problem solving.	1	2	3	4
42. Teachers should be concerned to change society.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
43. Teachers should attempt to devote more of their time to the least capable students in order to provide an equal education for all.	1	2	3	4
44. Teachers should consider the revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.	1	2	3	4
45. Given the highly competitive nature of our society, it is more important for students to be taught to compete successfully than to learn how to cooperate.	1	2	3	4
46. There should be set standards for each grade level and teachers should evaluate all children according to these standards.	1	2	3	4
47. Students should be given some options for deciding what to study during the school day.	1	2	3	4
48. Parents should play active roles in formulating school curriculum.	1	2	3	4
49. There is a great deal that is wrong with the public schools today and one of my priorities as a teacher will be to contribute as much as possible to the reform of public schooling.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B

Case Studies of Rachel, Hannah, Beth, and Sarah

APPENDIX B

Beth

Beth was a student teacher in a self-contained fifth-grade classroom. Hers was one of four fifth grades in a K-5 school enrolling about 500 children. The community includes a mix of parents who are young professionals, or work at skilled trades and commerce. There are few very affluent families and few qualify for welfare. The school's tradition is of a lively approach to a fairly traditional curriculum with a few individualistic teachers trying out forms of "open classroom" teaching or creating and teaching content that goes beyond the standard curriculum. Beth commented on the warm, friendly interactions among staff members and their ready acceptance of her as a student teacher.

Beth and her cooperating teacher chose to work together. In separate interviews each comments approvingly about the flexibility and "easygoing" nature of the other and of the classroom. Beth states her preferred teaching style to be one in which by artful questions and stimulating comments the teacher gets pupils to talk and build idea upon idea while the learning "just keeps flowing." In practice, Beth's teaching was more controlled and routine than that. Beth followed the prescribed curriculum and used the textbooks in a routine way, rarely adding to or extending the content in them. She recognized certain students of high ability as able to take part in a "flowing" discussion but rejected this as inappropriate for most students, who needed a more carefully prescribed curriculum. She did interrupt the textbook sequence in math in order to re-teach material she believed her students did not understand. She also planned and taught several short (2-3 day) units in science in which, for example, pupils observed chicks hatching

out of eggs or collected and examined snowflakes, but these were exceptions to letting the textbook determine her curriculum.

Relations with pupils were informal though controlled. Beth joked with them playfully ("raise your hand if you're not here"), did not object when pupils call her by her first name (though this made her feel uneasy), commented, "I'd like them to remember me as not their math teacher but that I was a fun kind of teacher." A typical comment to get pupils quiet was, "We need more silence so everyone can finish," justifying her request in terms of its helpfulness to pupils.

The cooperating teacher played the dominant authority role in the classroom. Beth saw her role to be transmitting the curriculum as determined by those in authority, helping her cooperating teacher carry out his plans to ensure the "basics" were taught, and adding some "trivial" extras (her term).

In the 10-week practicum preceding her student teaching semester, Beth had taught in a class with a high proportion of children from low-income homes. She believed they didn't need to learn the same kinds of things as students in her present school. The former need "something that you have to know to get by with." She believed her present students could benefit more from intellectually complex and abstract ideas. Beth expected pupils who are "behavior problems" to be less intelligent and to achieve at lower levels than conforming pupils. She hoped not to have to teach many "problem" children.

Beth's first year in a regular teaching position was as an eighth-grade teacher in a middle school in a suburban community about ten miles from a city of about 500,000 people. The community has some light industry but most residents worked in or on the edge of the large nearby

city. They were much like the parents of the pupils she had known as a student teacher--professionals, well paid skilled trades workers, and self-employed people who were moderately well-to-do.

The school was built to an architecturally open plan and enrolled sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade pupils. Groups of three or four teachers were organized into teaching teams to plan for and teach groups of from 80-120 pupils. There were three eighth-grade teams and five teams of sixth and seventh graders (combined in each team). Forty-four teachers worked with about 700 pupils. On the staff were specialist teachers of arts, reading, a general instructional consultant, teachers of children with "exceptional educational needs," and two guidance counselors. The tradition of the school was one of precisely detailed plans for teaching in a closely controlled environment, monitored by the principal and by tests of the levels of achievement by pupils of Performance Based Objectives (PBO's). The principal is a very strong personality, deeply committed to the curriculum and organizational pattern of the school, and constantly walking through the school to see if standards of quiet, busyness, and neatness are being met.

Two other teachers, both men and both teachers of more than ten years experience, join Beth in making up their eighth-grade team. The three work easily together. They meet for short planning sessions nearly every day, though "planning" consists mainly of decisions about timing and scheduling. Rarely do her colleagues suggest (or does Beth propose) that she give large-group presentations (i.e., to all 80 pupils in her team), even though, by the end of the year, her colleagues hope she would do some of these. Beth's major responsibilities are to teach four ability grouped classes in math and one class in reading/language

arts and to support the teaching of social studies by working with a group of about 25 pupils. Textbooks and their teacher's manuals generate most if not all the PBO's. Instruction is direct, with teachers deciding the amount of information and the pace of learning for individuals and groups. All groups try to learn the same information or skills and all will be measured against the same PBO's.

Knowledge is taught as though, by public agreement, it is known to be certain. From time to time, Beth acknowledges the private or personal ideas of a pupil but invariably presents a preferred and correct version, legitimate because "it will be on the test." During one observation, Beth says to her group, "The film [we are about to see] covers chapter 4 fairly well . . . You'll need to take notes. I'll stop the tape, tell you what's important, maybe repeat it for you."

It is clear that Beth perceives a number of institutional constraints that shape the choices she makes or that restrict the range of permissible choices. Time is one such constraint. This element is intensified in its effect by two other institutional constraints: the commitment of the staff to Performanced Based Education with precise quantities of information to be learned and tested; the organization of the school into teaching teams, where each teacher is responsible in an immediate way to the expectations of two or three colleagues, undertaking specific tasks and the achievement of specific goals, usually expressed as covering specified amounts of information related to a topic. The time constraint becomes an oppressive master and encourages teachers to overlook or ignore subtle differences in student understanding, settling instead for gross responses to individual differences (separate ability grouping permits more or less material to be assigned

and more or less time to be allowed for completion of tasks). Time constraints also encourage teachers to accept minimum competencies as the only competencies. There is little incentive to having students dig deeper once they understand the minimum, since it is only the accomplishment of the minimum (PBO's) by which pupil (and teacher) achievement will be judged. Time constraints intensify the effects of another institutional characteristic, the use of easily available materials and their use in a routine way, i.e., as information-givers rather than in less routine ways, e.g., as data to be examined, challenged, interpreted. (When asked why Annette is the only one who does something different than the teacher-suggested ways of reporting on a book, Beth replies, "It's enough if they do what's there.")

These approaches to knowledge/curriculum are legitimated by the existing teacher culture. Accommodating the other members of the team is an important and high priority. One of Beth's colleagues gets "too interested" in social studies. He is described as "carrying on" (going over the scheduled time), and criticized because taking the pupils off on "tangents" (going into material not tested by the PBO's) prevents his section from being ready to take the teamwide test on the date scheduled.

Personal constraints and personal preferences also help to form Beth's perspective. She feels she knows math and enjoys teaching it. She feels she has little background in social studies and believes that that constrains her from going any deeper or adding much to the information in the textbook or on the worksheets. At the same time she is uncomfortable with the uncertainty inherent in a problem-oriented lesson. Her eyes shone with excitement when some of her brightest math

students, almost spontaneously, started inventing alternative solutions to a math problem. But her stated preference, confirmed by her teaching, is for the comfort of knowing in advance of teaching what particular pupil responses you will get during a lesson.

Beth's view of teacher role has changed somewhat from her student teaching perspective. As a student teacher she expected a teacher to invent and develop curriculum even if only as additions to a prescribed curriculum. Her viewpoint now is that "expert others" (administrators, textbook writers, a committee of teachers) will decide what is to be taught; teachers are to manage that curriculum as skillfully as they can. This complements nicely her view of knowledge/curriculum and is supported by her school's curriculum pattern which is designed to make management easy.

Clearly, the teacher's role is sharply separated from the pupil's role. Teachers decide what tasks pupils will undertake, when they are to begin, when they are to stop working or turn to another task. What pupils <u>need</u> is what teachers decide they need, usually the result of a teacher analysis of what pupils lack, e.g., the math skills they fail on a test or information they don't know on a pretest.

Beth talks about nonacademic aspects of teacher role as having importance. Her role as counselor or guide to children is not salient, and almost no time is spent in informal or counseling discussions with pupils on matters not relevant to their academic performance, with the exception of a formal class group that discusses value questions, use of leisure time, and related topics. Interpreting school to parents is mentioned by Beth, but parent contacts seem to be almost entirely

confined to reporting progress and such school sponsored events as the class camping experience in which a few parents participated.

The most troublesome part of teacher role for Beth is her membership in a professional group. Early in the year she was distressed to discover that the "big happy family" guided by a benign principal was in reality a collection of factions who disagreed about most things but tended to agree that the principal was "management" and not one of them. By the end of the year Beth identifies with the teachers as a group but still wants to be guided by the principal and to meet his expectations for her. She feels deprived by the absence of the guidelines provided by continuous feedback to her when she was a student. She doesn't get much feedback from her colleagues and is ambivalent in wanting and yet afraid to get too much from the principal.

In most instances Beth's actions with respect to teacher role conform to and key on the attitudes and actions of her fellow teachers. She maintains a slight distance, e.g., she doesn't interact in a particularly warm or social way with the other teachers, but still seems to want to meet with their acceptance and approval. Beth is very "other-directed" and looks to her colleagues for cues on how to act the teacher role well. What she does as teacher is consistent with her personality and her personal preferences, her vision of herself as teacher. She is slightly ambivalent about routines of teaching. Sometimes she talks as though she should be doing more inventive things, but usually she seems to find the routines comforting. She knows what to do, what to expect if she does or doesn't do some things, how to negotiate for more options or more time with her team members and how to establish student routines

that make her bureaucratic responsibilities easier to meet, e.g., keeping order, having busy-looking students, meeting PBO's.

Beth finds it necessary for her own psychological comfort to control pupil behavior. First, she enjoys the sensation of being powerful, of making the pupils mind. Second, she prefers a more formal, somewhat distant relationship with her pupils. These are both illustrated in an instance she describes. She was annoyed by boys calling her by her first name, joking around, possibly with a mildly sexual connotation. ("Eighth-grade boys had . . . crushes, you could tell.") Beth reports dealing with this directly. ("I sat them down and said that I thought what they were doing was very annoying and I want it to end. And it did.") She comments early in the year that she would "rather have things a little more easygoing, maybe a little more joking around," but the overwhelming preponderance of Beth's comments and teaching behavior suggests just the opposite, that she is comfortable with a distance between students and herself, using controlling behavior to assert her authority and discouraging familiarity and bantering interchange.

Beth falls in with the existing teacher culture in sometimes being sarcastic or belittling students, especially those who are poor achievers, and especially one boy who is a butt of much of the teachers' sarcasm. (Interestingly enough, there is no evidence that this affects the boy's relations with other students, i.e., that they also ridicule him or reject him.) Similarly, she is reinforced by other teacher actions in demonstrating her ability to control students in her charge. There are institutional demands enforced by the principal--that the students be busy, quiet, and, generally, immobile (although the

principal seems to be sensitive to the strain that Beth is under as a beginning teacher and tries to get her to relax, smile more, enjoy her work). The distant, formal, controlling, teacher-pupil relationship seems to express the institutional norm. However, Beth is not merely constrained to conform to this. She likes controlling the students, winning the struggle to control, as it were, and doing so in a direct, public way. This confirms her in her role as teacher and expresses her own personal preferences for order, predictability, and cool teacher-pupil relationships that carefully separate the roles of teacher/friend.

Beth's perspective toward teaching has changed in certain important respects from the end of her student teaching semester to the end of her first year of teaching. Her approach to curriculum is much the same, transmitting mainly the information in textbooks or following the routines set out in teacher's manuals. The one content area, science, in which she introduced several short but lively lessons as a student teacher is an area she didn't teach in her team. The greatest change comes in Beth's relations with pupils. Student teaching was playful; teaching is serious. The student teacher tried to be a "fun" person; as teacher, Beth is a powerful, commanding person who controls behavior and punishes misbehavior. As a student teacher she comments on a teacher's inability to plan the same curriculum, have the same expectations of all children since they are so different from one another; as teacher she refines that belief to mean planning different strategies to get every pupil to meet the same objectives. This is not a matter of inventing or discovering an entirely different perspective on teaching from one held earlier. Rather we see a shift in which elements that were present

earlier become salient, while elements which were previously central drift down to very low priorities.

Rachel

Rachel was 22 years old when she began her student teaching experience in January, 1981. During this 15-week semester she taught in one of three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms in a K-5 public elementary school enrolling about 400 children. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents who range from moderately to very affluent. Most of the parents of the children who attend this school are either self-employed professionals (e.g., physicians, lawyers), employed by a nearby state university, or in state government. Rachel attended a Catholic elementary school as a child and completed her two pre-student-teaching practicums in what she describes as highly structured and teacher-directed classrooms in two different parochial schools. When given the opportunity, she deliberately chose to student teach in a less structured and more "easygoing" school where children's interests are incorporated into the curriculum and where she would have opportunities to develop her skills in planning and implementing a more varied and stimulating curriculum. "I didn't want to be in a rigid classroom. I've been in a rigid classroom my whole life."

Most of the teachers in Rachel's school, including her cooperating teacher and one of the other fourth/fifth-grade teachers, had worked together for at least ten years under the leadership of the same principal. This school has a very strong tradition which is described by Rachel's cooperating teacher as one of "active teaching." Teachers in

this school play a central role in developing the curriculum, are expected to make learning relevant and meaningful for children and to include pupils in the planning of classroom activities. There is the expectation for everyone who teaches in this school to plan an integrated curriculum around children's needs and interests and to bring many resources into the classroom other than textbooks, to make the curriculum "more alive and interesting for kids." This emphasis on "active teaching" which encouraged teachers to use independent judgment and creativity in planning the curriculum was evident throughout the entire school. The teachers in the three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms had recently developed their own reading program based on trade books, a creative writing program which had received national recognition, and generally planned classroom activities with a great deal of pupil input. There were very few institutional constraints on teachers' planning of the curriculum.

There was a very strong initial agreement between Rachel's goals for herself as a student teacher and the culture that pervaded her school. She began her student teaching with a desire to develop herself into an open and flexible teacher who is able to make school interesting and enjoyable for kids. "The important thing about school curriculum is that it excites and interests the kids. It's important to have a stimulating class." Rachel came into her student teaching experience with a feeling that schools generally promote pupil passivity. One of her priorities for this semester was to develop her abilities in planning activities that would help students become better able to make informed decisions for themselves and to defend a point of view based on concrete evidence. Many of the activities that Rachel planned during

the semester encouraged pupils to view knowledge as problematic, to consider conflicting viewpoints on issues, and to support their positions with reasoned arguments. For example, she structured many lessons where small groups of children would research topics and make presentations to the class and planned several debates where children were encouraged to express conflicting opinions on current public issues such as violence in America and animal extinction. Rachel's university supervisor commented that Rachel's actions throughout the semester indicated that she was more interested in getting kids to think "in-depth" about issues than with the quantity of material covered.

There were very few external constraints placed upon Rachel by her cooperating teacher in deciding what and how to teach. Rachel's cooperating teacher demanded the same kind of self-direction and inventiveness of Rachel that was demanded of all teachers in the school. Consequently, Rachel had numerous opportunities to make decisions about what and how children would learn and often made decisions about her teaching based on her assessment of what kids needed and what would interest them. At times Rachel's cooperating teacher would give her broad topical guidelines such as "weather" or "nutrition," and Rachel was free to develop specific objectives and activities as long as they were planned within the framework of "active teaching."

Rachel felt very strongly that children should be given opportunities to make decisions regarding both the content and organization of the curriculum. "Children ought to have input into their learning. They can make decisions about when they will do certain assigned work and what they will do within a certain framework." Throughout the semester, in addition to using her own judgment about what would be

relevant and meaningful for kids, Rachel involved the children in deciding such things as what public issues would be debated, which specific topics would be researched and how they would be presented, which specific books would be read, and in deciding when certain tasks would be completed.

The lessons that Rachel planned and taught during the semester incorporated many human and material resources from outside the classroom and often led the children into the neighborhood to investigate various questions and problems (e.g., identifying birds and trees). When inside the classroom the children rarely worked together as one large group and could most often be observed working individually or in small groups in various parts of the room. The variety of activities and active pupil involvement that were characteristic of Rachel's teaching this semester are exemplified by the observer's puzzlement when seeing two boys flying paper airplanes in a corner of the room and her wondering whether they were "fooling around" or completing some assigned task.

Rachel was very concerned about relating the curriculum to the lives of her pupils and with incorporating the personal knowledge of pupils into her lessons. She viewed knowledge as meaningful to students only when it is tied into their prior experiences. Because Rachel not only wanted to respond to her pupils' interests but to expand them as well, she frequently sought ways to make the curriculum "meaningful" for her pupils when they had no prior experience with what was being studied. For example, when reading a story about a blind girl in one of her reading groups Rachel arranged a trip to the Braille Society and a

meeting with a blind pupil in another classroom so that her pupils would have some personal experience that could be related to the story.

The central problem for Rachel as a student teacher was to develop skills and ideas for getting pupils actively involved in interacting with the curriculum. Her attempts to implement a varied curriculum which encouraged active pupil involvement were reinforced by her pupils' enthusiastic reactions to her teaching. The children, who had experienced a similar pedagogy throughout their elementary school careers, eagerly took advantage of opportunities to voice their opinions and to select content and materials to be studied. Rachel was encouraged by her pupils' reactions and commented, "They're really ambitious to learn. You get a lot of satisfaction when you see their excitement."

However, despite Rachel's success in implementing a varied curriculum which elicited the involvement and enthusiasm of children, her relationships with the children were relatively distant and formal and almost always focused on matters related to academic content. She was rarely observed interacting with children about personal matters not connected to the curriculum. Rachel expressed an ambivalence at the beginning of the semester regarding her desire and ability to exert her authority as a teacher when working with her class as a large group and generally felt more comfortable giving pupils assignments which would be completed individually or in small groups. She did not want to "set herself above the kids," but realized that she needed to exert some authority and to set some limits in order to accomplish her goals. This ambivalence about her authority as a teacher and her inability to establish warm personal relationships with children did not result in serious

problems this semester because of the self-directiveness of her pupils, but they would become matters of central importance the following year.

Because of the strong agreement between the latent perspectives that Rachel brought to student teaching, the culture of her school, the perspectives of both her cooperating teacher and university supervisor and the reactions of her pupils, Rachel was able to develop over the semester in a direction consistent with her initial goals. She and her supervisors felt that she came into the experience with lots of ideas about what should go on in a classroom but without the practical skills needed to make her pedagogy a reality. Rachel learned from her cooperating teacher and supervisor a variety of planning and organizational skills needed to make her lessons "flow." Rachel and her supervisors also felt that she became more comfortable by the end of the semester with exerting her authority as a teacher when leading a large group. Rachel felt very confident at the end of the semester about her abilities to implement "active teaching" and felt that her excitement about her work and her high expectations for pupil involvement would make the "active teaching" model successful with any group of children that she would teach in the future.

Rachel's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only seventh-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 Catholic parochial school located in the downtown area of a heavily industrialized city with a population of around 120,000. Rachel taught all subjects except science to her seventh-grade class (including religion) and taught social studies to the eighth-grade class across the corridor while the eighth-grade teacher taught science to the seventh graders. This city was experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the United

States during 1981-82 and most of the parents of Rachel's children had been employed (before being laid off) at a large factory located a few blocks from the school.

Most of the children in Rachel's class were of Italian heritage. Some had been born overseas and had recently moved to this city so that their parents could obtain work at the local manufacturing plant. Not all of the children, however, lived in the neighborhood surrounding the school and several parents drove their children to school each day because they wanted them to attend the same school that they had attended as children. The majority of the children were bilingual, fluent in both English and Italian, but several of the parents did not speak any English, which forced Rachel (who did not speak Italian) to communicate with them (e.g., during phone calls) through younger siblings of children in her class who happened to be home at the time.

The culture in this school was very different from that which existed in the school where Rachel student taught. Instead of an emphasis on "active teaching" there was a strong emphasis throughout the school on keeping the pupils quiet and busy. Rachel and all of the other teachers were given textbooks to use as the primary source in each subject area and were generally expected to cover what was in the texts. Teachers were free to supplement the texts as long as they did not stray too far and as long as the material in the texts was eventually covered. The principal, who checked teachers' lesson plans each week, said that she left the teachers pretty much on their own as far as <u>how</u> to teach but that she expected teachers to check with her first before trying something "too different." Teachers were also given daily schedules by

the principal which specified when and for how long each subject area was to be taught.

From the beginning Rachel felt a lot of pressure from the principal and the other teachers to keep her pupils quiet and busily working in their seats and worried that she would not be able to assume "the authoritarian teacher role" that was expected of her. "Discipline is the biggest thing in a Catholic school. They want discipline and they want quiet. That's probably the hardest thing for me." Throughout the semester Rachel interacted with the other teachers regularly on a social basis, but she did not feel that she got much assistance from the other teachers or from the principal in implementing her desired pedagogical approach. "The teachers are very nice, but I get no help. The most advice is that I've got a bad group and that I'll learn from experience." Rachel also felt that she did not get support from the majority of the parents of her pupils whom she felt expected her to do everything on her own.

At the beginning of the year Rachel was told by the sixth-grade teacher who had worked with her class the previous year and by most of the other teachers that her class was "pretty much impossible." "The teacher last year had the same problem with them and she never resolved it. She was just glad to get rid of them." Rachel was advised to structure her class very tightly and to exert a high degree of overt teacher control if she wanted her pupils to comply. Despite the fact that Rachel relied very heavily on the texts in planning her lessons, she largely ignored the advice of her colleagues and principal and from the very beginning tried to recreate her student teaching experience by planning special lessons to supplement or replace the more routine

lessons based on the texts. She taught several lessons toward the beginning of the year that required pupils to work independently or in small groups using reference materials to investigate specific questions and problems that had been designed to engage their interest and active involvement. For example, she began her math class for the year with a unit on graphing (which was not in the curriculum) where students were required to graph facts related to their own lives; planned a unit on poetry where students reacted to such poems as one about a boy who hated school, and wrote their own poems; and planned small-group research projects related to different cultures and climatic zones.

Rachel also continued her attempts to present knowledge to students as problematic even when relying on the texts and asked many open-ended questions that required independent thought and the application of ideas to new situations (e.g., why particular plants and animals are suited to some climatic zones and not others). Despite isolated successes with inquiry-oriented lessons, Rachel's students did not respond enthusiastically to her efforts to make at least some of the curriculum relevant and meaningful, and for the most part they rejected her efforts to involve them actively. Rachel placed part of the blame for her failures on the dominant culture of her school and her pupils' lack of experience with her methods. In December she comments:

> These seventh and eighth graders are already into their routine, and they're not used to doing things on their own. I've tried to have them do some kind of reference skills on their own, but they're totally lost. They can't handle it. I did that for two months and I'd help them but it didn't work at all. I figured out that I'm just gonna do it more structured and pass out worksheets and to do it as a large group together. It's really hard for them to do it if they're not used to it. At _____ they were doing it at the fifth grade and picking it up fast. They were probably doing it from the first grade . . . . Here, if you're having a bad day, the best thing to do is to read out of the book . . . . They will just

> line up like little soldiers and get their books out and read. That's not the best way to do it, but that's what they are conditioned into doing.

For the most part Rachel was unable throughout the year to get her pupils to respond either to the "active teaching" learned as a student teacher or to the more routine teaching that was characteristic of her new school. All of our observations indicated that Rachel was engaged in a continual struggle to get her pupils to complete work of any kind or to participate in class discussions. She frequently raised her voice to attempt to enable class discussions to be held; frequently repeated directions and information because of the lack of pupil attention; and frequently threatened, bargained with, and punished children in the hope of establishing a minimum amount of control.

Despite Rachel's attempts to elicit pupil cooperation, her pupils always seemed to get the best of the situation and to undermine her authority overtly and covertly. Rachel frequently became so frustrated with her pupils' lack of cooperation that she often lashed out at the class in anger ("Don't ask me what page we're on. I've told you three times already.") and threatened her class with extra homework, with staying after school, and with more routine work many times each day. "If you don't work on this we'll go back to worksheets." The pupils' resistance to Rachel's efforts was very strong and constant, and their contempt for her activity was often blatant and cruel. For example, during a discussion in the eighth-grade social studies class on Andrew Carnegie, several students openly copied insignias from record album covers, others threw things around the room, and one boy sat back in his chair with his feet up on his desk with a note stuck to his foot, "Do not disturb." At one point toward the end of the year Rachel's

frustration became so great that she openly cried in class and a pupil told the observer, "She said she couldn't stand it anymore." Students would pass notes to each other in open defiance of Rachel's directions, regularly fail to complete assignments on time, blatantly cheat on tests by walking around the room looking at others' papers, and often leave the room laughing when they were sent into the hall as punishment for misbehavior. The majority of her interactions with children were negative in quality, and pupils frequently responded to her requests with sarcasm. After Rachel scolded a girl for drawing during a math discussion, "There is a time and place for everything," the girl replied, "Seven o'clock tonight at Jack's house."

Despite her isolated successes in engaging her pupils on tasks, the struggle between Rachel and her students was so constant and dominant that during one of the rare moments of cooperation the observer comments in surprise, "The students are actually quiet and writing their poems." Because of the lack of pupil cooperation, Rachel was often forced to modify her plans and drop potentially stimulating activities for more routine tasks. For example, after attempting to begin a discussion in a social studies class by asking students to think about the difficulties and necessities needed in coming to the "New World" and after failing to get any response, Rachel comments, "We'll read now. It's the only thing you guys understand."

Throughout the year Rachel was understandably preoccupied with eliciting a minimal amount of pupil cooperation and was thrown so off balance by the strength of her pupils' resistance that she frequently failed to take advantage of those opportunities where pupils did cooperate. She was extremely frustrated about her failure to implement

"active teaching" ("They don't care about anything, and I don't know how to make it exciting for them.") and felt that she wasn't sure that she had the resources within her to succeed with the more routine approach to teaching that her pupils were used to.

> I guess that I don't feel I have the right to tell them that they have to listen. I feel like they should want to learn and that I shouldn't have to cram it down their throats . . . I feel that I have a lot to offer them, but I guess it's idealistic of me to think that they're gonna sit back and become knowledgeable and then go out and fight the world. I have to get into a more authoritarian role, but it's very hard to come by for me.

Although her successes continued to be rare throughout the year and her pupils' apathy and resistance continued to the very end, Rachel was able to find some psychological peace by the end of the year by disconnecting her "self" from her work. In April she comments, "I think I've come to the conclusion that this is a job and that is all it's going to be. The most important thing is not to get too wrapped up in it . . . . I've come to realize that all places aren't going to be like last year and that all kids aren't going to be that excited about learning."

However, despite Rachel's eventual detachment from her work and her hope that the year would end as soon as possible, she continued under great odds to plan at least some of her lessons within the mode of "active teaching." For example, in April she spent a lot of time planning a unit on the labor process where small groups of students went out into various work places in the community (e.g., hospital, courthouse, local factory) to interview workers about job specialization and work interdependency. Although there was almost no reinforcement for this type of activity from her pupils, their parents, other teachers and the principal, Rachel tenaciously clung to her belief that the willing

cooperation of her pupils could be elicited by relevant and meaningful lessons that encouraged active pupil involvement.

Despite the great differences between Rachel's actions as a student teacher and as a teacher, her perspective toward teaching had not really changed by the end of the year. Despite her frequent comments about the need to become more authoritarian in her approach, Rachel was to some extent both unwilling and unable to adopt the more routine pedagogy and authoritarian teacher role that was characteristic of her school. Although she was largely blocked from realizing her own goals as a teacher because of her pupils' rejection of what she tried to offer them, the most significant aspect of Rachel's first year of teaching was that she kept on trying (although with less enthusiasm at the end) to elicit the willing cooperation of her pupils through the curriculum rather than through the authority of the teacher. Her ambivalence toward exerting her authority as a teacher was present throughout her student teaching and came to play a more significant role in her perspective toward teaching by the end of the first year. Rachel was offered a contract in June for the following school year but did not sign it.

Sarah

As a student teacher, Sarah chose to work in a junior primary classroom. This not only provided the kindergarten placement she wanted, but also provided a full-day program with one group of pupils. Children in the junior primary class had completed the kindergarten year but were judged not ready for first-grade work. Edgeton School had

about 500 pupils in three classrooms at each grade level from kindergarten to sixth grade. It was built to an open architectural plan but with removable walls. The teachers chose to have the walls up to make each classroom a separate and more private place. There was only one junior primary classroom and it enrolled 11 children in the semester that Sarah was a student teacher.

There was no established curriculum for the junior primary class as there was for all the other grades. The cooperating teacher was expected to find or invent activities that would help the pupils begin to read and do number work, as well as become more practiced in following classroom routines and less dependent on continual teacher direction and assistance.

This particular cooperating teacher appealed to Sarah because of her consideration for her pupils and because of what Sarah perceived to be the sense of community which marked the attitudes of pupils toward one another. Sarah described herself as someone who does not challenge authority or like to argue. (Her supervisor saw her as a very quiet person who would be unlikely to pursue or defend a position contrary to what those in authority wanted.) Sarah thought that the unspecified curriculum and the open and welcoming attitude of the cooperating teacher would provide space for her to "try things out." This proved to be an accurate perception.

Sarah's general belief was that knowledge was largely problematic, with meanings shaped by the personal experience of the pupils. She encouraged the very young children she taught to think carefully about their observations and often asked them why they thought something had happened. She had learned about the language experience approach in her

reading methods course but had never seen it in action. Although it was quite different from anything her cooperating teacher did, she was encouraged to try it. She felt free to select topics for study and taught units on the senses (touch, sight, etc.) which relied mainly on active observations by pupils followed by conclusions being drawn from what was observed.

There was a great deal of variety among her pupils that Sarah recognized and for which she planned either quite different tasks or as a result of which she expected somewhat different responses to a whole group discussion or a worksheet given to everyone. She said she was trying to know each child and become sensitive to what might hurt someone, what might stimulate someone to like himself better and want to work harder. Hers was a very light touch on the reins of control. The small class size seemed to make little control necessary, and Sarah was crisply sure of herself, her control and structuring of activities visible but unobtrusive. She concentrated closely on what her pupils said and did, and was easily able to shift direction or re-plan on the spot if she was getting signals suggesting the children did not understand or had exhausted their ability to continue.

Sarah believed the teacher role to be to choose goals, but she expected that these goals need not contradict nor conflict with the expectations of a prescribed curriculum. In addition she expected to be imaginative enough to integrate pupil interests into the teacher selected program, to exercise control without being harsh, uncaring or insensitive to the varied abilities and character of her pupils.

The school where Sarah found her first regular teaching job was in a suburban community only about five miles from Beth's school district,

but with children coming from more affluent homes. The school was a low, attractive building designed to look from the outside like a large single-family house set back in a very large yard. Inside, its design accommodates 15 self-contained classrooms at each grade level from kindergarten to fifth grade; there are three fourth-grade classrooms. The school staff had the services of a reading coordinator, a school psychologist, special teachers for art, music, physical education, and for children with learning difficulties.

The prevailing school philosophy was that children should be stimulated to achieve high academic standards that would lead to success at academic levels beyond the elementary and high school. Teachers at each grade level tended to coordinate their work somewhat with one another, moving at almost the same pace and covering the same topics. There was little opportunity for planning or even carrying on discussions with teachers at other grade levels because teacher time was constantly in use. Even the half hour teachers were required to stay at school after the pupils left, seemed to vanish in meeting the requirement that teachers must stay with bus-riding children until they were safely loaded onto the school bus. There were no scheduled recess times, and teachers tended to provide recesses as these fell conveniently into the schedule, supervising the children's play themselves.

There is a general but mild anxiety among the teachers about meeting the expectations of parents that pupils will achieve well. Pupils are generally highly motivated, even competing with one another in achieving academically. Teachers perceive the parents of these children to be insightful enough to notice when their expectations are not met, powerful enough not to be satisfied by bland assurances.

Although the school follows a fairly conventional curriculum in the various subjects, some teachers encourage active investigation by pupils, and most teachers appreciate and share their class' artistic work proudly. This fits into their perception that parents expect the school to go beyond a routinized curriculum.

When asked what behavior he would approve in a first-year teacher, the principal says,

> I would say the flexibility of the teacher, being able to change plans in midstream . . . when things aren't working out, to be flexible and try a different approach. I would also expect to see that the first-year teacher would take care of the individual differences in the classroom and not be teaching en masse lessons to the youngsters . . . . The teacher would have to have a very positive outlook and be very humane in her treatment with the youngsters . . . not to create a classroom . . . with threats and duress that children would be placed under because the demands of the teacher [were followed] with certain punitive measures.

This flexible, responsive, and humane teaching is to take place within a curriculum framework of topics that are to be the same for all teachers at a grade level. As the principal describes it,

> The important thing is that the youngsters are exposed to the same curriculum as the other fourth-grade children in the other classrooms. It would not be permissible for her to bring in an outside unit that did not pertain to the study of Wisconsin, say, that she decided she was going to study about Africa . . . . Science would be the same thing. There are certain units that must be taught to the fourth-grade children . . . . The strategies that she employs are up to her . . . [also the order in which units are taught] would be her option.

Teachers acknowledge that the formal culture of the school contains these explicit constraints. An informal culture of belief and behavior quietly contravenes many of these rules under such conditions as the following: there is no direct and open challenge to the authority of the formal culture or its spokespeople (particularly the principal); teachers meet most or all of the requirements of the standard curriculum

before undertaking any innovations; academic achievement (especially on standardized tests) remains high; parents do not complain; pupils are not unusually noisy or out of the control of the teacher. As part of the informal culture, teachers add content that interests them into the standard curriculum (e.g., a teacher suspends the formal teaching of reading for three weeks while a class writes and produces a play); they manage activities discouraged by the principal (a teacher has pupils bring hammers from home on the bus for a construction project since, though discouraged, it was not expressly forbidden by the principal); teachers loosen the supposed control of curriculum guides by keeping them in the closet unused while they use the texts and mutual agreement among those teaching at a grade level to preserve a more or less coordinated and coherent curriculum. Thus, while the curriculum topics control what is taught, there is considerable freedom to add topics, to lengthen or compress the time spent on a topic, and to arrange for various approaches to teaching any topic.

The informal culture often supports the formal culture, as in the following incident:

> Sarah was told by one of her colleagues that on Fridays she can put the kids on the bus and "just keep walking," as no one expects teachers to stay until 4:00 p.m. on Fridays. A teacher notices her leaving the school and comments, "We're supposed to stay until 4 o'clock." Sarah says confidently, "Oh no, on Fridays you don't have to." In the next faculty meeting the principal comments that teachers are not to leave school before 4 o'clock, including Fridays. A second colleague of Sarah's explains that she often leaves early but always asks for and gets the principal's permission to do so. Sarah uses the bureaucratic structure after this, asks to leave early several times and is never refused.

Sarah's perspective toward teaching was extended and strengthened by the experiences of her first year of teaching, but not substantially

changed from the perspective that developed by the end of her student teaching.

Sarah views knowledge as being legitimated by public agreement but believes that knowledge can be refined by testing it against one's personal experience and common sense. She continually invites children to relate concepts and information to their own lives. A very typical question for her is the one she asked after a boy read from a newspaper article describing flooding on the Red River, "Could you imagine what it would be like to be flooded out of your house?"

Consistent with such a view is Sarah's belief that knowledge is problematic, not certain. Scattered throughout every teaching day are questions and comments that encourage pupils to challenge ideas or to search for another way to understand something or another way to do something. In an interview, one boy describes a situation in which "you have to prove your facts and Jeff and I take up about the majority of science period shouting at each other trying to prove our facts."

Language/reading is organized to be taught to small groups of approximately 10 students, but much of the work is individualized and quite varied. Creative writing and creative dramatics are encouraged, as is frequent use of the school library. Math is highly individualized and typically presents an image of children working in groups, in pairs, or by themselves--some at the chalkboard, some in the hall, others scattered around the room. Two or three children are designated to correct student work or act as helpers. When that fails to help them understand, pupils ask Sarah for help. New concepts are sometimes introduced to the whole group but are more likely to be presented to groups of five or ten children. Science is taught as a whole group

activity with texts being used mainly for their illustrations and ideas for experiments. Unlike one of her colleagues who performs experiments while the pupils watch, Sarah has small groups do the experiments themselves, then justify and challenge one another's conclusions.

The typical pattern throughout her curriculum is one in which she, as teacher, decides the over-all approach and its purposes, presents the topic, but builds in options. In math, pupils choose where, with whom, how quickly, and in what sequence to perform tasks. In other content areas the choices are more restricted but independent decisions are considered by the teacher, often approved and rewarded when they are productive in terms of teacher goals (as when a boy constructs a periscope at home after reading directions for making one in their science text). The more obvious signs of a standardized curriculum (such as ditto masters) are absent partly as a result of control by the principal. In one incident:

> Sarah tells pupils who want to put a crossword puzzle on a ditto not to use dittos anymore. Later, Sarah comments to the observer that once she was running something off like this and [the principal] "gave me a funny look." Asked if she thought he disapproved, Sarah answers, "Yes, because [one of the other teachers] told me once she did and [the principal] told her not to."

Yet Sarah's curriculum, if not her teaching, is closely coordinated with that of the other fourth-grade teachers.

Sarah relates to her pupils in a warm, direct style that is very empathic.

> Child: Miss _____, can you come see something I did on mine [haunted house]?
> Sarah: I sure can. I'd love to, in fact.

On another morning, Sarah is kneeling at the desk of a mentally retarded child mainstreamed into her class.

> Emily is feeling unhappy. Sarah is kneeling at Emily's desk, rubbing Emily's back. Emily is crying. A minute of silence [during the sharing of news articles]. Sarah asks, "Anyone else . . . news?" Joanne holds up a poster of cars she drew for fun. Another minute of silence as Sarah talks to Emily. Emily wipes her eyes and gets ready to go to reading.

Sarah is crisply self-assured in directing pupils to address tasks. Pupils seem to require little motivating to get them on task. The work interests them and they respond eagerly to Sarah's encouraging them to take initiatives, look at an idea from a different vantage point, and make choices. They are easily kept to an acceptable noise level. For her part, Sarah is relaxed with purposeful pupil movement and the hum of activity, as well as with the periodic litter resulting from an active program. Her pupils quickly clean and straighten up the classroom when asked to do so.

Prominent in Sarah's view of a teacher's role is being responsible for what happens in the classroom. Textbooks, curriculum guides, school regulations or the norms of the informal teacher culture must be respected, but they are all open to criticism and can be modified if need be to serve the interests of her pupils as she understands them. Sarah expects to accommodate to institutional constraints but not to be controlled by them. She decides what "rules" she can follow and makes her conformity very visible. She expresses her own values and interests but does this quietly, through subtle insertions into the regular curriculum and rarely if ever in an overt, direct challenge to institutional norms. Within her institution's constraints she has found and created opportunities to be the kind of teacher she wants to be. She turns to the other fourth-grade teachers and to specialists (reading coordinator, school psychologist) for advice about what or how to teach. She picks and chooses from this advice as well as from suggestions from

her closest colleagues about how to use the bureaucratic structure of the school for her own purposes. The pace of activities, the burden of varied school responsibilities, and her conscientious efforts to meet the demands of teaching leave her little time to interact with other teachers outside of the fourth-grade group. She seems content to maintain some distance and insure her privacy from the other members of the staff. While she attends meetings of the school's teacher association unit, she is put off by the disagreements and hostility she perceives there and she never speaks during the meetings.

Although the range of income differences within Sarah's classroom is fairly narrow and represents a fairly affluent group, there is some ethnic variety and a spread of intellectual abilities. Sarah seems to respond to each child as an individual. The variety interests her. She sees it in a positive way as a teaching problem that challenges her imagination and inventiveness and makes the classroom a more interesting place. She seems to enjoy some of her pupils more than others but those reactions seem to be the result of personality compatibilities or clashes rather than the group membership of any of her pupils. She is perceived by her pupils to act in an evenhanded way toward members of the class. She tries to challenge the three or four unusually bright children in her class and regularly gives extra attention and warmth, though not a great deal of teaching time, to the mentally retarded child mainstreamed into her room. Sarah's curriculum is designed to respond differentially to the individual variations among her pupils.

Summarizing briefly, Sarah has extended and maintained the perspective toward teaching which had developed by the end of her student teaching semester. In part, the institutional constraints and elements

of the formal and informal cultures of her school were supportive of her preferred perspective. In part, her ability to maintain a low profile while challenging school norms in very subtle ways and her inventiveness in creating accommodations that satisfied institutional demands and her own personal demands at the same time, made it easy for her to develop more practiced expressions of her perspective toward teaching.

Hannah

Hannah was 24 years old when she began her student teaching experience in January, 1981. During this 20-week period she taught along with four certified teachers in one of two fifth/sixth-grade teams in a suburban middle school (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades only) enrolling about 500 children. There were four teaching teams in this school, each one responsible for the instruction of approximately 120 children. Hannah had her own homeroom class of around 30 pupils and worked with almost all of the pupils on the team at one time or another, since the instructional program was totally departmentalized. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents ranging from a few who were very poor and on welfare to some who were highly paid professionals. Some of the parents owned or worked on farms, others worked in the village in which the school was located, and the majority commuted to work to a nearby city with a population of around 175,000. The majority of the parents were moderately well off and lived in the village.

Teaching was the second career choice for Hannah since enrolling at the university. She had spent some time studying medical technology,

but did not like "sitting on a bench working with machines all day," so she switched her major to elementary education. Since high school Hannah had done a lot of volunteer work with children and she saw teaching as an opportunity for her to combine her strong interest in science and health related issues with her love for children. Hannah began the semester very confident in her abilities as a teacher and saw the student teaching experience as a chance for her to experiment with a variety of teaching styles, to bring more ideas into the curriculum, and to establish warm and close relationships with children so that they would become excited about learning and feel good about themselves and school. She chose to work in her school because it offered one of the few paid positions in the program, because she was impressed by the modern and attractive physical plant, and because she was given the impression that she would be able to use her judgment in planning the curriculum and that she would be able to use materials beyond those provided to her by the school.

Almost immediately Hannah discovered that her initial impressions of the school were incorrect. "They do a nice job of sugar coating. The first impression is nice but then you live in it and it changes. They do not tell you a lot . . . that got shattered pretty fast." Hannah soon discovered that she was expected to follow the standardized curriculum very closely and to maintain a distance from pupils that made her uncomfortable. She was given lists of specific objectives in each subject area that she was expected to cover and was provided with all of the materials and tests that she was expected to use. All of the children went through the same curriculum at different speeds. Not only was Hannah expected to cover a specific curriculum using prepackaged

materials and tests, but she was expected to cover this curriculum within specified periods of time and with a minimal amount of noise and pupil movement. The children switched within the team to different rooms at specified time intervals, and Hannah had very little choice about when subjects would be taught and for how long. Because of the open architectural design of the school where no walls separated classrooms, all of Hannah's actions were totally visible to the other members of her team. She was told that a minimum amount of pupil noise and movement was necessary with such a design so that classes would not disturb one another.

From the very beginning Hannah openly questioned the departmentalized school structure, the rationalized form of the curriculum, and the distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils that were a part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school. Hannah's cooperating teacher and university supervisor were very aware of her discontent with the school. "She believes the curriculum is too rigid and is always asking why are we doing this" (cooperating teacher). "She thought that her team members were very cold toward the students" (university supervisor). For the first six weeks Hannah tried to run a classroom that violated many of the norms in her school. For example, after her frustration with her pupils' lack of understanding of math concepts, she "dumped" the required math worksheets for two days each week and used Cuisinaire rods to teach math concepts and skills. She also planned a unit using the newspaper in place of the basal reader, attempted to set up learning centers in language arts, and broke down preexisting ability groups by combining children who had previously been classified as high and low achievers. Generally Hannah felt that she

was being asked to fit into a teacher mold that she did not like ("They really tried to put a lid on things I wanted to do."), and openly antagonized the teachers on her team by her efforts to go off on her own. "I find that I'm forced into doing things I don't want to do and I want to break the mold." Despite the pressures on her to maintain a distance from her pupils, Hannah also tried to relate to pupils in areas beyond the academic curriculum and in ways not approved by her school. For example, after catching a few of her pupils smoking marijuana on the playground, Hannah did not report the incident to her principal and spoke with the children alone after school. She felt that dealing with drugs, sex, and social issues was an important part of her role as a teacher and tried to gain the confidence of her pupils so that they would confide in her.

Hannah was generally not very successful in implementing her "deviant pedagogy" during the first six weeks. The children did not cooperate with her efforts to relate to them in a more personal way and frequently complained that they were "falling behind" when Hannah moved away from the prescribed curriculum. As a result of Hannah's lack of success with her methods, she was continually told by her supervisor and colleagues that she was too idealistic and was asked to consider whether teaching was really for her. "She came in with a lot of fantasy ideas of what teaching was all about and wasn't ready for the real world of teaching" (cooperating teacher). The amount of pupil resistance was not that great but clearly stood out in comparison to the other quiet and smoothly running classrooms on her team.

Feeling all alone and getting constant pressure from her colleagues and pupils to conform to the norm, Hannah made a conscious decision by

the end of the sixth week to comply strategically with the accepted way of life in her school. "I didn't want to be put down anymore. There was no support there. I conformed to the situation for the sake of not taking the hassle. I didn't enjoy it, and it wasn't me." From the seventh week on Hannah stuck more closely to the required curriculum and kept her discontent about school practices to herself. When asked why she no longer voiced her opinions to her colleagues and supervisor, she responded, "Because you want to have your degree and get a recommendation and finish."

Despite her strategic compliance to the expectations of her teachers, Hannah continued on her own to attempt to implement a more varied and lively curriculum and to relate to students in a more personal way. Most often she followed the curriculum and put on the "teacher mask" when in view of her colleagues, but she continued throughout the semester to plan supplementary lessons that altered the students' relations with each other, with the curriculum, and with the teacher. In May the observer comments, "The contrast is great between Hannah's area and the rest of her team where the students are always sitting behind their desks. Hannah rearranges her room, and the kids are allowed to be all over the place working at different things." At the end of the semester Hannah's cooperating teacher and the supervisor were both aware that her compromises after the sixth week represented only strategic compliance and not a change in her perspectives. "I don't think she believed half of the things I was telling her" (cooperating teacher). "I think that although she had to compromise at times she has not changed deep down in the way she will approach teaching in the future." Because of the great discrepancy between the latent (but not

fully developed) perspectives that Hannah brought to the experience and the culture of her school, she was not able to develop as a student teacher into the kind of teacher she hoped to be. She felt that she was on her own throughout the semester and felt there was no one in her school to whom she could turn as a model or who could teach the skills she wanted to learn. "I learned a lot of things of what not to do." Despite the lack of support, Hannah was not able to separate her "self" from her role as teacher and at the end of the semester she still clung to her view that warm and close relationships between pupils and teachers, getting kids excited about learning and feeling good about themselves were the keys to learning. Hannah strongly believed, despite the lack of confirmation from this semester, that the "academics will come easily" after a teacher is able to open up the communication lines between herself and her pupils and establish a relationship of trust. Hannah also continued to express her views in relatively general terms about the importance of integrating pupils' personal knowledge into the curriculum and of making learning fun. Because Hannah was not able to get the guidance that she desired, she was not able to develop (as did Rachel) the skills and strategies necessary for realizing her goals. She reacted strongly against becoming the kind of teacher she saw around her but did not develop well articulated perspectives consistent with her own vision of teaching. At the end of the semester Hannah was convinced more than ever that she wanted to be a teacher and was eagerly looking forward to teaching in a classroom with four walls and toward working with one group of children. Her primary goal for her first year of teaching was to "be able to know my kids really well."

Hannah's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only eighth-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 public school enrolling about 190 pupils. This school is located in a rural farm community a few miles outside of a city with a population of 9,000. Hannah taught all subjects except civics to her eighth-grade class and taught science to the seventh graders. The parents of the children in her class were very diverse socioeconomically, ranging from those who were farm owners and professionals to those who were farm workers. For the most part Hannah's class had been together as a group since kindergarten and would be attending the junior high school in the nearby small city the following year. All of the teachers lived in the immediate area with the exception of Hannah and one other teacher who commuted from a city 45 minutes away. Hannah was also the youngest teacher in the school and the only one who had not completed a teacher preparation program at one of the relatively small state colleges which are now part of the state university system. Finally, Hannah was the fifth new teacher that had come to work in this school in the last three years. Three of these teachers were no longer teaching in this school because of alleged problems with pupil control and with staff, and the fourth teacher has requested a transfer to another school.

The culture and tradition of this school is very complex. On the one hand there is a very strong individualistic tradition in the school that sanctions a teacher's right to do things in his or her own way and there is very little cooperation or coordination among the staff. All of the classrooms except for the seventh and eighth grades are totally self-contained, and each teacher is responsible for all of the instruction for a group of around 25 students. Most of the teachers had been

teaching in the school for many years and several had begun their careers in rural one-room school houses where the teacher had total control over the management of the classroom and curriculum. The principal of the school is also a full-time classroom teacher and does not observe or confer with teachers except for weekly staff meetings which are held after school and occasional individual conferences with teachers.

Consistent with the individualistic tradition of this school there were relatively few overt controls exerted on teachers with respect to the planning and teaching of the curriculum. Teachers were usually given curriculum guides and textbooks for each subject area and were expected to cover the content specified in the guides in whatever order, at whatever pace, and with whatever methods they thought were most appropriate. "Their approach to teaching would be pretty much up to how they feel they can teach the particular subjects in the best way . . . . As long as she's [Hannah] following good ethical procedure I would say the rest is up to her" (principal). Teachers were also free to supplement the texts with any other materials and to go beyond what is listed in the curriculum guides as long as the curriculum was covered by the end of the year. During this particular year the curriculum guides were being revised in the district's central office, and Hannah did not receive a copy until April. She was told by the principal to follow the textbooks to ensure that she was covering the required content, but little or no effort was made to see that she did follow them. The most significant controls that were placed on teachers' handling of the curriculum were in the areas of grading and testing. All teachers were expected to give each child 30 "marks" for each subject per report card

period and to grade students according to a standard grading scale (e.g., 92+ = A). There was also a great deal of emphasis placed upon pupil performance on the national standardized tests given each spring. The principal, who was willing to tolerate a variety of instructional approaches from his teachers, told Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher (whose approaches were clearly different from the rest), "We'll see how your techniques work when the kids are tested." Despite the relatively low controls on how the teachers taught the curriculum, all of the teachers with the exception of Hannah and her colleague in the seventh grade stuck fairly closely to the texts.

Alongside the tradition of individualism in this school, there was also a very strong and mostly unspoken agreement among all but the seventh- and eighth-grade teachers about the way in which teachers should relate to their pupils. This approach was characterized by one teacher who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history as "the old school method . . . you can't have someone here who is too soft with the kids." Hannah became aware of this consensus on teacher-pupil relationships ("In this school it's the teacher's role to be the disciplinarian") through her observations of how other teachers acted, through her pupils' comments, and indirectly through the "grapevine" of her school. Other teachers would rarely confront Hannah directly with criticisms of her more informal style of relating to pupils beyond telling her that she was inexperienced and would eventually learn that "certain methods just won't work." On several occasions, however, teachers complained to the principal, who in turn passed the word to Hannah, that she had violated the preferred formality and distance between pupils and teachers. Hannah was criticized for such things as

trusting kids too much, hugging them too much, and for playing her stereo too loud and too often. All of the other classrooms with the exception of the seventh and eighth grades were kept under tight control by the teachers (e.g., kids sitting in rows and quiet). Despite the relative autonomy which existed for teachers at school, there was a strong informal agreement among staff which initially made Hannah feel isolated and alone.

> You begin to try new things; everything is not out of the textbooks or worksheet oriented. They look down on that. But they don't constrain you and say you can't do things. They would never say you can't do something. They'll do it in a roundabout way . . . when it comes back to you, you feel that everyone else is against you.

The community was characterized by Hannah and the two teachers interviewed as extremely conservative and suspicious of new ideas. According to the seventh-grade teacher, "They want a strong emphasis on the three R's and see the rest of the curriculum as extra." A teacher who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history felt that most of the parents approved of the "old school" methods and expected teachers to maintain tight control over pupils. She stated that many of the parents know what to expect from the teachers because they had attended this school as children. Hannah initially felt more pressure from the parents than from her colleagues to conform to the unspoken tradition regarding the teacher's role and was initially reluctant to act on her instincts because she felt she was perceived as an outsider.

At the beginning of the year, despite the lack of close formal supervision, Hannah relied heavily on the textbooks in planning the curriculum; however, she also made efforts from the very first day to establish warm and close relationships with her pupils in violation of the school tradition. Hannah continued to describe her basic orienta-

tion to teaching as "humanistic" and tried to emphasize the affective and interpersonal dimensions of her work. She felt strongly that a positive self-concept is the key to learning and wanted to find ways to make school enjoyable for both herself and her pupils. Hannah went out of her way to present herself to her pupils as a "human being" by openly admitting her mistakes and ignorance with regard to curricular content and by freely sharing aspects of her personal life with her pupils. She also made many efforts to get to know each child in her class very closely and to gain her pupils' trust and confidence. For example, early in the year Hannah began the practice of having pupils keep journals which she responded to on a regular basis, took pupils on several weekend field trips, and arranged weekend pajama parties with the girls in her class.

As a result of these and other efforts, Hannah was able to gain access to information regarding many aspects of her pupils' personal lives such as their feelings about their parents and about dating habits. Initially her pupils were very suspicious of Hannah's efforts to break down the conventional barriers between teacher and students and there was a lack of support from her colleagues. Hannah became confused and uncertain in the fall about the direction she should take, and she established several classroom practices and rules which violated her own vision of "humanistic teaching." For example, student grades in math and spelling were read aloud each day, and several arbitrary rules were put in place to monitor pupil behavior (e.g., zeros were given for talking during the reading of grades). Despite these isolated instances where Hannah flirted with more conventional methods of controlling her pupils, for the most part she exerted little direct control over pupil

behaviors as pupils gradually began to respond to her efforts, and by November there appeared to be little difference in the pupils' behavior whether Hannah was in or out of the room. The pupils generally stayed on task with little direction and there were very few instances where Hannah was observed disciplining pupils for misbehavior.

Despite her efforts to establish warm and personal relationships with her pupils which were gradually becoming more and more successful, Hannah was frustrated with her heavy reliance on the textbooks in the curriculum and with her failure to establish a more varied and lively instructional program. While she was very sure of herself in dealing with children in interpersonal matters (e.g., she spoke with children about how to make friends and about dating), she felt that she did not have a clear idea of how to implement her preference for a more integrated curriculum which incorporated children's personal experiences, which gave pupils concrete experiences to relate to ideas, and which elicited their enthusiam and excitement about solving problems in relation to the world around them. "I just feel like I'm spoon feeding them and opening their heads and pushing the knowledge in."

Knowing that her pupils had been taught "right out of the textbooks" in the past and that they would be taught so in the future, and not confident that she was able to explain to others how particular methods were meeting specific academic goals, Hannah worried a lot about handicapping her students and about not giving them what they were "supposed to learn." She stated that not only were her ideals new to the school, but that they were also new to her. By December Hannah had given up any hopes of meeting her curricular goals and was so frustrated that she considered quitting teaching and accepting another job. After

she informed her pupils of a job offer she had received in another state, the pupils got together and tried to convince her to stay and presented her with a certificate praising her fine work. Hannah decided to stay in her present job largely due to the reactions of her pupils and continued to search for ways to realize her curricular goals.

Another reason why Hannah decided to stay in her job was because of the reactions of the parents of her children. From the beginning of the year Hannah made many efforts to win the trust and confidence of the parents and to learn more about the ways and mores of the community. For example, she visited farms and learned how to milk cows, went bowling regularly with parents, and saw them on a social basis. After an initial distrust of this "outsider" who was attempting to relate to pupils in a way very different than the other teachers, Hannah felt that the parents began to support her ("they were 110 percent helpful") when they noticed that their kids were more involved and enthusiastic about school, were asking different types of questions, and were experimenting more in relation to the world around them. Hannah's ability to mobilize parental support was a significant factor in her ability to violate the school culture and to gradually succeed in running a classroom more consistent with her ideals.

As the year progressed, Hannah became more and more satisfied with her approach to the curriculum. She continued to rely mainly on the texts in planning her lessons (particularly in math), but she gradually made more and more independent decisions that resulted in a greater emphasis on providing concrete experiences for children and on incorporating their personal lives into the curriculum. For example, in the spring Hannah took her class to the state capitol (four hours away) in

connection with a unit on state government, initiated a drive to collect one million bottle caps to help kids understand the concept of a million, and had her pupils do aerobic exercises in connection with the study of respiration rate. To some extent Hannah had been doing these kinds of things all along (e.g., setting up a frog hospital for an entire day in December where the kids dissected animals), but the degree to which she moved away from the texts increased over the course of the year. By April Hannah felt confident enough to drop the basal readers and have her pupils read novels, and to let two pupils teach a unit on engines to the class which drew on their experiences in repairing farm vehicles. Throughout the year Hannah continued to expose all kids to the same curricular content and to stay fairly close to the text in some subjects (e.g., math), but her work in language, reading, and science reflected more and more of the active pupil involvement and problematic approach to knowledge that she had hoped to create since the beginning of her student teaching. By the end of the year Hannah felt that she had come close to her ideal where pupils are thinking critically and constantly and where they are always asking questions and trying to apply their in-class learnings to everyday life.

One of the significant reasons why Hannah was able to move from a point in December where she considered quitting, to a feeling of satisfied accomplishment at the end of the year was the support she received from the seventh-grade teacher. Although this teacher did not model the kind of pedagogy that Hannah hoped to create, he was generally sympathetic to her ideals and supported her efforts to relate to and teach pupils in her preferred way. Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher were able essentially to create a school within a school where they teamed

for science and civics instruction (the first teaming in the school's 20-year history), started a student council and school paper, and coached volley ball and track together. The seventh- and eighth-grade classes frequently did things together that did not include the rest of the school (e.g., play softball games), and the two teachers together were able to withstand the evident displeasure of their colleagues. Our interviews with the eighth-grade pupils without exception confirmed that life in these two classrooms was very different from that in grades 1 to 6. By the end of the year Hannah's pupils unanimously expressed their appreciation for the year that Hannah was able to provide for them. Several of the girls looked to Hannah as a "big sister" rather than as a teacher.

Because of this support from the pupils, parents, and the seventh-grade teacher, and because of Hannah's own skills in dealing with people and her sensitivity to the political nature of schools, she was able to significantly redefine many aspects of school in relation to her own class. She openly questioned many school rules and regulations, such as the rule which required students to sit in assigned seats in the lunch-room, and openly took "effort" into account in the grading of her pupils in violation of school district practice. Significantly, Hannah's class scored the highest of all of the eighth grades in the district on the standardized tests given in the spring. Hannah felt she was able to demonstrate that you can relate to pupils in a humane way and still accomplish academic goals. She was disappointed, however, that she was unable to influence the practices of the other teachers and create a more humane environment throughout the school.

At the end of the year Hannah was looking forward to being rehired the following school year despite receiving a lay-off notice which was justified in terms of declining enrollments. The parents of her children were so satisfied and enthused about the job that Hannah had done this year that they petitioned the school board to rehire her despite the added costs. Despite being rehired for the 1982-83 school year, Hannah saw herself eventually getting certification as a school guidance counselor so she could work exclusively in the interpersonal domain. Although she felt she had succeeded during this year, she felt that in the long run that there were too many obstacles in the way for her to feel satisfied with a career in teaching.

APPENDIX C

Dilemmas of Teaching

APPENDIX C

Dilemmas of Teaching

Following are the definitions for each of the 17 dilemmas that were used to define teacher perspectives in this study. These dilemmas represent a refinement of our initial orienting framework and emerged from our study of 13 student teachers. If a dilemma was also utilized by Berlak and Berlak (1981) and/or by Hammersley (1977) this fact is noted in parenthesis at the end of the description of the dilemma.

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Public Knowledge--Personal Knowledge

On the one hand, an emphasis on public knowledge indicates a view that school knowledge consists primarily of accumulated bodies of information, skills, facts, etc. which exist external to and independent of the learner. On the other hand, an emphasis on personal knowledge indicates a view that the value of school knowledge is established primarily through its relationship to the learner. Implicit in this position is the view that school knowledge is useful and significant only insofar as it enables persons to make sense of their experience.

What is at issue here is the clarity of the distinction that the teacher makes between public knowledge on the one hand and pupils' everyday knowledge on the other. To what degree is students' personal knowledge ruled out as irrelevant in the teacher's definition of the school curriculum? To what degree does the teacher allow or even encourage children's interests, background experiences, etc. to contribute to the school curriculum? (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

2. Knowledge is Product--Knowledge is Process

An emphasis on knowledge as product indicates a view of school knowledge as organized bodies of information, facts, theories, etc., and the evaluation of pupil learning is seen as a question of conformity to or deviance from specifications laid down by the teacher (e.g., the "correct" answer). The process by which the answer is reached is regarded as relatively unproblematic. Here there is a concern for the reproduction of an answer by whatever means. On the other hand, a knowledge as process emphasis indicates a concern with the thinking and reasoning underlying the production of a product and this thinking process is viewed as a way of establishing the truth or validity of a body of content. The central issue here is whether mastery of content or substance takes priority over the mastery of skills of thinking and reasoning. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

3. Knowledge is Certain--Knowledge is Problematic

An emphasis on knowledge as certain indicates an approach to school knowledge as truth "out there" to be uncritically accepted by children. On the other hand, where the emphasis is on knowledge as problematic, school knowledge is treated as constructed, tentative, and subject to social, political, and cultural influences. Here there is a concern with developing children's creative and critical abilities. (Berlak & Berlak)

4. Learning is Fragmented--Learning is Holistic

An emphasis on learning is fragmented indicates a view that learning is the accumulation of discrete parts or pieces; when one has mastered the pieces, one "knows" the whole. There is little concern that the parts be seen in relationship to the whole either before, during, or after the learning experience. From the learning is holistic perspective, the understanding of a whole is sought and is seen as a process that is something more than the learning of a series of parts. Learning is seen as the active construction of meaning by persons, and opportunities are provided for pupils to mentally act upon the material and to relate it to something already known. (Berlak & Berlak)

5. Learning is Unrelated--Learning is Integrated

This element is concerned with the degree to which teachers view school knowledge as compartmentalized within specific disciplines or content areas (unrelated) or the degree to which the boundaries between content areas are blurred (integrated). An integrated curricular emphasis would indicate that the teacher has made efforts to subordinate previously insulated subject areas to some relational idea or theme. (Hammersley)

6. Learning is Collective--Individual Activity

From the perspective of learning is an individual activity, learning proceeds best as an individual encounter between the child and material or between the child and teacher. Learning is seen as a function of each individual child's particular capabilities and/or motivation. On the other hand, an emphasis on learning as a collective activity indicates a view that learning proceeds best when ideas are exchanged in a cooperative and supportive setting where one person can test out his/her ideas against those of others. There is thought to be a construction of meaning by the community of learners that goes beyond what can be gained by individual encounters with materials and with teachers. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

7. Teacher-Pupil Control over Pupil Learning: High--Low

The question here is the degree of control that the teacher versus pupils exert over such aspects of learning as when pupils are to begin an activity, how long they are to work at a particular

task, how pupils are to perform the tasks, and criteria by which student work is evaluated. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant--Personal Teacher-Pupil Relationships

A distant orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to maintain relatively detached and formal relationships with children, to maintain "a guarded professional face." On the other hand, a personal orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to establish close, informal, and honest relationships with children. Here the teacher is observed interacting with pupils about matters other than schoolwork, and "participates" with pupils rather than remaining detached. (Berlak & Berlak)

9. Teacher vs. Pupil Control over Pupil Behavior: High--Low

On the one hand, high control over pupil behavior indicates that the teacher makes many explicit rules for governing a wide range of pupil behavior. On the other hand, low control over pupil behavior indicates that children are asked to assume a great deal of responsibility for their behavior. There are not many explicit rules, and those that do exist are relatively ambiguous and/or narrow in scope. (Hammersley)

The Teacher's Role

10. The Teacher's Role: What to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding what to teach in relation to institutional requirements of schools and/or school districts. On the one hand, a bureaucratic response indicates that the teacher generally follows with little question the school curriculum that is prescribed by a school or school district. Here the teacher feels that it is inappropriate to alter that content which is prescribed from above, and the teacher recognizes the legitimate role of the institution to dictate practically all of the content of the school curriculum. On the other hand, a functional response indicates that there is evidence that the teacher adapts and interprets prescribed content for use in their particular situation. Finally, an independent response indicates that a teacher shows evidence of actively constructing curricular content independent of institutional directives. Here teachers may even ignore institutional directives and substitute content that they and/or the children have decided to address.

11. The Teacher's Role: How to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding methods of instruction and is concerned with the degree of personal discretion utilized by teachers in determining the processes of their lessons. Bureaucratic, functional, and independent responses are defined as in the preceding dilemma.

12. The Teacher's Role: School Rules and Regulations.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role in relation to school rules and regulations. A bureaucratic, functional, and independent response are defined as above.

Student Diversity

13. Children as Unique--Children as Members of a Category

This dimension focuses on the degree to which teachers think about children as alike (a focus on shared characteristics) or in terms of a unique mix of many dimensions. How many and what kinds of categories does the teacher use to draw distinctions among children and how differentiated are the various categories? (Berlak & Berlak)

14. Universalism--Particularism: School Curriculum

A universalistic position would indicate a belief that all children should be exposed to the same curriculum either at the same time or at a different pace. On the other hand, a particularistic response indicates that a teacher feels and acts in a way that indicates a concern that there are some elements of the curriculum that should be offered only to certain individuals or groups of children. (Hammersley)

15. Universalism--Particularism: Student Behavior

A universalistic position indicates a situation where the same rules for behavior are applied to all students (e.g., uniform sanctions for the same transgressions). A particularistic position indicates a situation where rules for behavior are applied somewhat differentially. Here when the teacher applies rules for behavior he/she takes into account individual student characteristics such as age, ability, home background, etc. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

16. Allocation of School/Teacher Resources: Equal--Differential

On the one hand, some teachers take the position that all students deserve an equal share (in terms of both quantity and quality) of school resources such as teacher time, materials, and

knowledge. On the other hand, some teacher's hold the view that some individual students or groups of students merit a greater share of resources than others. This element addresses the question of distributive justice in the classroom. (Berlak & Berlak)

17. Common Culture--Subgroup Consciousness

A common culture emphasis indicates a desire to develop in children a common set of values, norms, and social definitions. On the other hand, a subgroup consciousness emphasis indicates a desire to foster in children a greater awareness of themselves as a member of some subgroup distinguished from others by such factors as language, race, ethnicity, etc. (Berlak & Berlak)

18. Career Orientation in Relation to Student Diversity

A restricted career orientation indicates a desire to teach only certain groups of children during a teaching career. Little restriction with regard to career orientation indicates a willingness to teach many different groups of children. Race, socioeconomic class, and ability level are the categories which emerged to distinguish different groups of children.

APPENDIX D

Presentations and Publications

APPENDIX D

Presentations and Publications

I. Presentations

1982

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K. M., Densmore, K., Adler, S., & Egan, K. The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. AERA, March, 1982, New York City (ERIC No. ED 218 251).

Adler, S. Elementary school social studies: The development of student teacher perspectives. AERA, March, 1982, New York City.

Egan, K. Carol, Laurie, and Rita: Three persons in the act of becoming teachers. AERA, March, 1982, New York City.

1983

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K. M., Densmore, K., & Hudak, G. The development of teacher perspectives. AERA, April, 1983, Montreal (ERIC No. ED 240 112).

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. Teacher perspectives in the face of institutional press. AERA, April, 1983, Montreal, (ERIC No. ED 240 113).

Densmore, K. The world of work: The development of teachers' and students' perspectives. AERA, April, 1983, Montreal.

Zeichner, K. Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. Presented at a National Invitational Conference "First Years of Teaching: What are the Pertinent Issues?" March, 1983, Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin, Texas.

1984

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. AERA, April, 1984, New Orleans.

Zeichner, K. The ecology of field experience: The role of field experience in teacher development. Association of Teacher Educators, February, 1984, New Orleans.

1985

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. Individual and contextual influences on the relationships between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors: Case studies of two beginning teachers in the United States. Annual meeting of the International Association for the Study of Teacher Thinking, May, 1985, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.

Zeichner, K. Content and contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. AERA, April, 1985, Chicago.

Densmore, K., & Zeichner, K. Teacher perspectives as a lens for examining teachers' personal knowledge. Invitational Conference, "Classroom Studies of Teachers' Personal Knowledge," Toronto, Canada, December, 1985, sponsored by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

1986

Zeichner, K. The practicum as an occasion for learning to teach. Keynote address, The National Australian Conference on the Practicum in Teacher Education, Geelong, Australia, January, 1986.

II. Publications

1981

Zeichner K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 7-11. Reprinted in Education Digest, November, 1981, pp. 40-43.

1982

Zeichner, K. (1982). Why bother with teacher induction? In G. Hall (Ed.), Beginning teacher induction: Five dilemmas. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Adler, S. (1982). Elementary school social studies: The development of student teacher perspectives. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison (Dissertation Microfilms No. 82-24-026).

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8, 34-54.

1983

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

1984

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teacher experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 28-36.

Densmore, K. (1984, September). An interpretation of teaching: Two case studies of beginning teachers. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

1985

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11, 1-25.

Zeichner, K. (1985). The Wisconsin study of teacher socialization: Implications for policy, practice, and research. In S. Hord, S. O'Neal, & M. Smith (Eds.), Beyond the looking glass: Papers from a national symposium on teacher education policies, practices and research.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Conclusions from the Wisconsin studies of teacher socialization. Dutch Journal of Teacher Education, No. 3, 117-124.

Zeichner, K. (1985). The ecology of field experience. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18(3), 44-52.

In Press

Zeichner, K. Individual and institutional factors related to the development of teacher perspectives. In L. Katz & J. Raths, Advances in teacher education, Volume II. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experience in teacher development. In L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Volume III. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. The socialization of teachers: Implications for practice in teacher education programs. Bildung und Erziehung, 1986, No. 3 (West Germany).

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B., & Densmore, K. Individual, institutional, and cultural influences on the development of teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Zeichner, K. Content and Contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. Journal of Education for Teaching.

Note: The Teacher Belief Inventory (Appendix A) has been adapted for use in teacher practicums and has been published in G. J. Posner (1985), Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching, New York: Longman, Inc.

APPENDIX E

Project Staff

APPENDIX E

Project Staff

Principal Investigators

B. Robert Tabachnick and Kenneth M. Zeichner

Project Assistants

Kathleen Densmore, 1980-1984

Kathleen Egan, 1980-1981

Susan Adler, 1980-1981

Glenn Hudak, 1981-1982

Project Secretary

Elvira Benter